University of Louisville

ThinkIR: The University of Louisville's Institutional Repository

Electronic Theses and Dissertations

12-2020

Teacher perceptions of collegial collaboration in an academy structure.

Kristy Marie Field
University of Louisville

Follow this and additional works at: <https://ir.library.louisville.edu/etd>

Part of the [Educational Leadership Commons](#), and the [Secondary Education Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Field, Kristy Marie, "Teacher perceptions of collegial collaboration in an academy structure." (2020).
Electronic Theses and Dissertations. Paper 3529.
<https://doi.org/10.18297/etd/3529>

This Doctoral Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by ThinkIR: The University of Louisville's Institutional Repository. It has been accepted for inclusion in Electronic Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of ThinkIR: The University of Louisville's Institutional Repository. This title appears here courtesy of the author, who has retained all other copyrights. For more information, please contact thinkir@louisville.edu.

TEACHER PERCEPTIONS OF COLLEGIAL COLLABORATION IN AN ACADEMY
STRUCTURE

By

Kristy Marie Field
B.S., University of Rio Grande, 2001
M.A., Ohio University, 2015

A Dissertation
Submitted to the Faculty of the
College of Education in Human Development of the University of Louisville
in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements
for the Degree of

Doctor of Education
in Educational Leadership and Organizational Development

Department of Educational Leadership, Evaluation and Organizational Development
University of Louisville
Louisville, Kentucky

December 2020

Copyright 2020 by Kristy Field

All rights reserved

TEACHER PERCEPTIONS OF COLLEGIAL COLLABORATION IN AN ACADEMY
STRUCTURE

By

Kristy Marie Field
B.S., University of Rio Grande, 2001
M.A., University of Rio Grande, 2005
M.A., Ohio University, 2015

A Dissertation Approved on

November 10, 2020

by the following Dissertation Committee:

Dr. Kyle Ingle

Dr. Deborah Powers

Dr. Byron Keith Davis

Dr. Lu Young

DEDICATION

This dissertation is dedicated to every strong woman who has ever been told she cannot, should not, or will not. These 186 pages are proof that we can, we should, and we will.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank the members of all of my families – nuclear, professional, friend, and academic – for their unending support during this process.

To Dr. Kyle Ingle, thank you for pushing me to be a researcher and writer at levels I did not believe possible.

To Dr. Deborah Powers, thank you for...everything. You pushed, pulled, dragged, coached, cheered, and willed me at various points in this process and I absolutely could not have done it without you, for you, I am forever grateful.

To Dr. Keith Davis, thank you for bringing your brand of humor and honesty to this process.

To Dr. Lu Young, thank you for your willingness to be a part of my committee and continuing to be a part of my professional journey.

To the teachers who gave their time, energy, and knowledge to my research, thank you. I will forever admire your dedication to your students and your craft.

To the members of my cohort, thank you for helping me grow as a student, a professional, and a person.

To McMillin and Hinds, thank you for your support, your honesty, and your ability to find humor in any situation, even stats.

To my children, thank you for being my greatest accomplishment.

To my husband, thank you for always supporting me, encouraging me, believing in me, and being my best friend.

ABSTRACT

TEACHER PERCEPTION OF COLLEGIAL COLLABORATION IN AN ACADEMY STRUCTURE

Kristy Field

November 10, 2020

Collaboration in is an often researched, many-named concept with a definition which has historically been unclear. What one calls collegiality another may call teacher teaming and yet another may refer to as professional networking. Scholars agree effective teacher collaboration can lead to higher student achievement, teacher efficacy, and teacher retention. However, as elusive as an agreed-upon definition may be an agreed-upon structure that fosters an effective version of this collaboration.

When Ford began the Ford Next Generation Learning initiative, they embarked on the path to developing a school model that focused on school and community partnerships to support long-term, transformational change. They did so believing meaningful professional collaboration was an essential component of the model. Since the inception of the Ford NGL program in 2005, over 500 high schools in the United States have become part of the network of NGL academy schools; in 2016, Bryan Station High School in Fayette County, Kentucky became one of them.

In an effort to improve student culture and achievement, administration at Bryan Station High School adopted the Ford NGL academy structure. The school is divided into five academies, or small learning communities, within which students study under the umbrella of the Freshman Academy or one of four career academies. Teachers are members of small learning communities (SLC) and professional learning communities (PLC). Dedicated time built into the schedule allows teachers to meet in these groups to focus on academy level information (SLC) or content level information (PLC).

I used a case study design to explore how teachers describe their experiences with collegial collaboration before and after the implementation of the academy model. I conducted descriptive analysis of data from two existing surveys, a district-based academy teacher survey and the TELL Kentucky teacher survey, I also conducted a Group Level Assessment (GLA) with ten participants who have taught at the subject school before and after the adoption of the academy model. My research shows that while effective teacher collaboration is dependent on many factors, these teachers perceive their professional collaboration to be more effective in an academy structure than in a traditional school structure.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

DEDICATION	iii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	iv
ABSTRACT	vi
LIST OF TABLES	xii
LIST OF FIGURES	xiii
CHAPTER I	1
INTRODUCTION	1
Background	1
Significance of the Study	3
Context of the Study	4
Research Questions	6
Social Constructivism	7
Definition of Terms	8
Methodology	9
Limitations	9
Organization of the Study	10
CHAPTER II	12
LITERATURE REVIEW	12
Vocational and Career Education in the United States	13

Research on the Career Academy Model.....	18
Ford Next Generation Learning	21
Teacher Collaboration.....	22
Professional Learning Communities (PLCs)	25
Summary of Literature Review.....	27
CHAPTER III	29
METHODOLOGY	29
Research Method and Design—Qualitative Case Study	29
Strengths and Limitations of Qualitative Case Studies.....	31
Context of the Study	32
Data Sources	34
Teacher Survey	34
TELL Kentucky Survey	34
Group Level Assessment	38
Data Collection	38
Teacher Survey	38
TELL Survey	39
Group Level Assessment	39
Data Analysis	40
Teacher Surveys.....	40

TELL Surveys	40
Group Level Assessment	41
Ethical Considerations	41
Ensuring Credibility, Transferability, Dependability, and Confirmability	43
Summary	43
CHAPTER IV	45
RESULTS	45
Bryan Station High School: A High School that Transitioned to an Academy Model	46
Teacher Profiles	46
Teacher Perceptions of Collegial Collaboration Prior to the Academy Model	47
Evidence from TELL Kentucky Survey	48
Evidence from Group Level Assessment.....	50
Teacher Perception of Collegial Collaboration after Academy Model Adoption	52
Evidence from Academies of Lexington Teacher Survey	52
Evidence from TELL Kentucky Survey	57
Evidence from Group Level Assessment.....	60
Emergent Themes	63
Chapter Summary	66
CHAPTER V	67
CONCLUSIONS.....	67

Discussion	67
Implications for Policy and Practice	71
Implications for Future Research.....	72
Conclusion	73
REFERENCES	75
APPENDIX A: ACADEMIES OF LEXINGTON REFLECTION SURVEY 2020.....	83
APPENDIX B: 2017 TELL SURVEY QUESTIONS	95
APPENDIX C: GROUP LEVEL ASSESSMENT	112
APPENDIX D: INFORMED CONSENT	116
APPENDIX E: RECRUITMENT CORRESPONDENCE.....	120
APPENDIX F: TELL KENTUCKY 2017 SURVEY RESULTS	121
APPENDIX G: KENTUCKY TELL SURVEY 2015 AND 2017 RESULTS COMPARISON	153
APPENDIX H: GROUP LEVEL ASSESSMENT RESULTS.....	162
APPENDIX I: GROUP LEVEL ASSESSMENT THEME RANKING FORM AND RESULTS	169
CURRICULUM VITA	172

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1. Demographic Information of GLA Participants	47
Table 2. 2015 TELL Kentucky Survey Responses	48
Table 3. Responses Prompt 1 Specific to Collaboration Prior to the Adoption of the Academy Model.....	51
Table 4. School and Academy Participation/Completion of Academies of Lexington Teacher Survey.	53
Table 5. School and Academy Descriptive Analysis Results, Question 7.....	54
Table 6. School and Academy Descriptive Analysis Results, Question 25.....	56
Table 7. School Descriptive Analysis of Question 7 and Question 25	57
Table 8. 2017 TELL Kentucky Survey Responses	58
Table 9. 2015 to 2017 Percentage Change of TELL Kentucky Survey Responses.....	60
Table 10. Prompt 2 Responses Specific to Collaboration After the Adoption of the Academy Model.....	61
Table 11. Teacher Identified GLA Theme Ranking and Points	64
Table 12. Teacher Perceptions of Collegial Collaboration in Non-Academy and Academy Structures	66

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1. Yin's (2018) Typology of Case Study Design.....	31
---	----

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Iterations of how to “fix” education are endless. A vast amount of time and resources are continually devoted to this task, but they often fail to address questions key to the future of education. What is the goal of education? Is it for every student to go to college? Is it for every student to be career-ready, or is it to prepare students for the world they will face when they graduate? The answer may be yes to all three. If one accepts that high schools should be preparing students to be working adults, it is incumbent on the educational institution to work with those industries and employers who will one day be hiring the graduates.

Background

In 2005, businessman and philanthropist Bill Gates described his perceptions of the state of high school education in the United States:

America's high schools are obsolete.

By obsolete, I don't just mean that our high schools are broken, flawed, and under-funded—though a case could be made for every one of those points.

By obsolete, I mean that our high schools—even when they're working exactly as designed—cannot teach our kids what they need to know today. (paras. 11-13)

In response, Fischetti and Smith (2010) explored commonalities between the breakdown in American secondary education and the breakdown in the automotive

industry. They believed education in the United States, like automotive production, stagnated due to the sustained idea that historic policies and procedures remained ideal in today's world. In order for both to be competitive, both would need to change drastically how they educated and engaged their workers and students.

In 2006, the North Carolina Board of Education and Honda formed a partnership to educate graduates for 21st-century careers. Together, the two entities rewrote the mission for North Carolina Public Schools to read, "Every public-school student will graduate from high school globally competitive for work and postsecondary education and prepared for life in the 21st century" (Public Schools of North Carolina State Board of Education, 2006). This helped spark a movement to change education in the nation, starting with a push to break-up large public high schools into small learning communities called "academies" (Fischetti & Smith, 2010).

The structure of these academies has undergone sweeping changes since the concept first appeared in the realm of high school education more than thirty years ago. According to a 2000 report by Kemple and Snipes, the target population for these academies changed. What began as a way to prevent high school dropouts and prepare those with a high failure risk for work transformed into a method to prepare students for both work and college. Over time, career academies have come to serve a broader cross-section of students, including those who are highly engaged in school (Kemple & Snipes, 2000).

Academies focus on connecting students with their coursework. Research reveals that when students can connect coursework with a possible career path their engagement increases (Dixon, Cotner, Wilson, & Borman, 2011; Fletcher & Cox, 2012; Kemple &

Snipes, 2000). Measurable improvement has not been limited to student engagement. Studies have also shown an improvement in attendance rates, graduation rates, and the percentage of students moving successfully from the ninth to the tenth grade (Levine, 2010). With these demonstrated gains, many more schools and districts are making the shift to the academy structure. For example, according to their 2018 Network Profile, when Ford Next Generation Learning Network (2019) launched its Career Academy initiative in 2008, seven communities were participating; in 2018, there were more than 345,000 students in 43 communities.

As of the 2019-2020 school year, three schools within Fayette County Public Schools, an urban district in Kentucky, are operating with a full career academy structure, with each school in different stages of implementation. In the 2019-2020 school year, Tates Creek High School was in its second year of operating with an academy structure, while Frederick Douglass High School began its third year of a “wall-to-wall” academy structure. The third school, and the subject of this case study, is Bryan Station High School. Initially Bryan Station implemented only a Freshman Academy; the following school year it launched four career academies and entered its fourth year of operating with a full, school-wide career academy structure in the 2019-20 school year.

Significance of the Study

Fayette County Public Schools (FCPS), in Lexington, Kentucky, includes five comprehensive high schools that, according to the most recent state accountability system, earned between one and three stars on the five-star rating scale (Kentucky Department of Education, 2019). The schools are rated based on performance in the areas of proficiency in reading and math on the ACT exam taken by all juniors,

proficiency in science and writing on the K-PREP test for grade ten, transition readiness through a variety of college or career readiness tests or certifications, and graduation rate (Kentucky Department of Education, 2019). Bryan Station High School, which serves as the context for this case study, earned one star for the 2018-2019 school year.

As accountability measures continue to evolve, it is important that schools identify which practices and structures have a positive impact on student and teacher outcomes. Research has shown that effective teacher collaboration has a positive impact on both student performance (Goddard, Goddard, & Tschannen-Moran, 2007; Seashore-Louis, Dretzke & Wahlstrom, 2010; Ronfeldt, Farmer, McQueen, & Grissom, 2015) and teacher effectiveness. Various studies cited effective teacher collaboration as having a positive relationship to teacher efficacy (Pounder, 1999; Rosenholtz, 1989), teacher retention (Kardos & Johnson, 2007; Youngs, Holdgreve-Resendez, & Qian, 2011), and teacher perception of positive impacts of effective collaboration (Ronfeldt et al., 2015). In this study, I will examine how teachers perceive collegial collaboration in a traditional school setting and in an academy structure.

Context of the Study

The research setting is a public high school in Lexington, Kentucky in its fourth year of whole-school Career Academy implementation. At the time of this research, Bryan Station High School currently had a student population of approximately 1,400 students in grades nine through twelve. The school had approximately 100 full-time teachers, six academy principals, six academy counselors, one academy coach, and one executive principal. Bryan Station High School began the transition to academies in the 2016-2017 school year with the implementation of the Freshman Academy. It became

the first high school in Lexington to implement the career academy structure fully in the 2017-2018 school year with the addition of four career academies.

At Bryan Station High School, all ninth-grade students are placed in the Freshman Academy where they begin to explore academies and pathways as they relate to college and career plans. The Freshman Academy structure seeks to support both academic and non-academic outcomes. A 2012 study by Muschkin and Bonneau examined the effects of a Freshman Academy on some of these outcomes. Their findings included “slightly better” performance on Biology and Algebra I End of Course exams (EOCs) by Freshman Academy (FA) students when compared to non-FA students. Their most significant findings were in the areas of attendance, tenth-grade promotion, discipline (non-FA students were suspended at a rate four times that of FA students), dropout rates (three percent for FA students versus twelve percent for non-FA students), and eventual enrollment in four-year colleges (Muschkin & Bonneau, 2012).

Tenth, eleventh, and twelfth graders are members of four career academies at Bryan High School. These are Leadership, Information and Technology, Engineering and Robotics, and Medical. Each academy contains at least three career pathway options that culminate in a unique career certification or an end-of-program assessment that fulfills the state requirements to deem the student transition ready.

An important hallmark of the career academy structure is the effective implementation of teacher Professional Learning Communities (PLC) and/or teacher Small Learning Communities (SLC). These groups engage in an ongoing process to support students behaviorally and academically, resulting in better student achievement (Hoagland, Birkenfield, & Box, 2014). Based on content areas, PLCs address topics such

as subject-specific material, student concerns at the content level, and district mandates as they pertain to each instructional area. Based at the academy level, SLCs address broader topics such as student concerns across academic subjects, behavior, attendance, academy wide concepts, and cross-curricular collaboration. Findings by Hoagland, et al. (2004) support the intentional nature of this design, stating that the significant difference between collaboration in professional learning communities and collaboration in other cooperative teams is the fact that organizations create PLCs for a specific purpose, such as ensuring students learn essential skills. In the subject school, time is devoted to these teacher-learning communities in the form of both PLCs and SLCs.

Research studies reveal the importance of professional collaboration and its positive association with student learning and positive perceptions among teachers (Ketterlin-Geller, Baumer, & Lincoln, 2015; Goddard et al., 2007; Seashore-Louis et al., 2010; Ronfeldt et al., 2015). Despite the increasing popularity of the Academy structure, research focusing on collegial collaboration in PLCs and SLCs specifically within the academy structure is scarce. The field lacks information on how teachers perceive the impact of this structure on their ability to engage in meaningful, effective professional collaboration. The findings will be important to support the continued implementation of both effective collegial collaboration and the academy structure.

Research Questions

As districts seek new ways to “do school”, they need data and information to justify changes to school structures, plans, and goals. The impetus behind my study was to provide needed data, specifically around the concept of teacher professional collaboration as well as what school structures may support this collaboration. Providing

this information may assist districts with their decision-making and planning processes.

The specific purpose of my qualitative case study was to explore whether teachers perceive collegial collaboration as more authentic in a career academy structure. The study answered the following research questions:

1. How do teachers perceive their experiences with collegial collaboration in a traditional school setting prior to adopting the academy model?
2. How do teachers perceive their experiences with collegial collaboration in an academy setting after adopting the academy model?

Social Constructivism

I framed my study in social constructivism. This theory has its basis in the work of Jean Piaget; however, the theory I used is the most closely related to Vygotsky's constructivism. Vygotsky's constructivism theory places an emphasis on the individual's social interaction in the development of cognition (Kim, 2001). Vygotsky described a process where social interaction precedes the development of knowledge and cognition. At the root of the theory lies the essential concept that individuals create meaning through their understanding of an experience or phenomena as interpreted through their prior experiences and their understanding of the world around them (Creswell, 2014). As teachers further their experience in a traditional school, their teaching practices may reflect the beliefs of this structure. As such, teachers who work in schools with an academy structure have practices that may be reflective of this structure. Chng & Lund

(2018) describes how once these practices are in place they become part of the teacher's pedagogical approach and are often difficult to change.

Definition of Terms

I used the following terms in the context of my study:

Academies of Lexington is a group of three high schools within Fayette County Public Schools, which launched a career academy initiative based on the Academies of Nashville model in partnership with Ford Next Generation Learning.

Career Academy is a small learning community within which a student receives academic instruction at his/ her assigned high school combined with work-based learning opportunities.

Community refers to cities or school districts when referred to in the context of Ford Next Generation Learning.

Group Level Assessment (GLA) is a qualitative and participatory, large group, data collection method in which timely and valid data are collaboratively generated and interactively evaluated with relevant stakeholders leading to the development of participant-driven data and relevant action plans.

Professional Learning Community (PLC) refers to a group of educators who teach the same content area and meets regularly, share expertise, and work collaboratively to improve teaching skills and the academic and behavior performance of students.

Small Learning Community (SLC) refers to a subdivision of large school populations into smaller, autonomous groups of students and teachers. In this study, SLC may also refer to a group of educators who are members of the same career academy.

Methodology

To investigate how the implementation of Career Academies affects student engagement, I used a multiple case study approach. The use of a case study approach “is particularly useful to employ when there is a need to obtain an in-depth appreciation of an issue, event or phenomenon of interest, in its natural real-life context” (Crowe et al., 2011). I used a purposeful sampling strategy, as described by Creswell and Poth (2018), to first identify teachers who have experience in traditional and academy structures at the same school. This assisted in limiting the similarities and differences in teacher collaboration to the school structure as much as possible.

Limitations

The limitations of my study included the potential for subjectivity, inability to establish reliability and validity of a data source, small sample size, response bias due to the participant relationships to the researcher, as well as broad application of the research findings. I remained aware of the inclination to manipulate results toward a desired outcome; this awareness prevented misinterpretation or unintentional skewing of the teacher responses. The Academies of Lexington Teacher Survey is developed and implemented exclusively within Fayette County Public Schools. District and school level leaders within the Academies of Lexington initiative first administered the survey at the conclusion of the 2018-2019 school year as a way to gather teacher feedback specific to the academy structure. The group altered both the form and substance of the survey significantly at the conclusion of the 2019-2020 school year. As a result, information did not exist to establish validity and reliability of this survey. The sample size was limited due to the criteria for teachers to be included in the study since participants must have

taught in both an academy and non-academy structure at Bryan Station High School. The method of interview data collection had the potential to influence teacher responses. I made efforts to ensure teachers knew there would be no negative effects for responses perceived to be unfavorable. This included ensuring that for a minimum of one school year I would not be the evaluating administrator for any participant who I directly supervised. Factors unique to the subject school, rather than attributed exclusively to the academy structure, could limit possible applications of the research; one such factor was a change in administration the year prior to the adoption of the academy model.

Organization of the Study

This report is comprised of five chapters including an introduction, literature review, methodology, findings, and conclusions. In this chapter, I introduced the topic of the academy structure as well as a brief history of career and technical education as it relates to this structure. I have described how I intended to carry out my research, provided information about the subject school, and introduced my research questions. Also included are definitions of key terms, which will appear in subsequent chapters.

Chapter II features a summary of the history and evolution of “school” as it has led to the academy structure. It then describes the role the Ford Next Generation Learning foundation has played in the implementation of the academy structure in the subject schools. I also further explore the concepts of teacher collaboration, Professional Learning Communities, and Small Learning Communities. Chapter II provides an overview of existing research on the concept and structure of academy high schools. It also focuses on how that structure may influence teacher perception of collegial collaboration.

Chapter III focuses on the methodology and design of the research process. It provides a description of the selection criteria and demographic information of the study participants. Chapter III also details information about the process that I utilized to gather information and how I analyzed the results. I discuss ethical considerations as well as the efforts to minimize potential misinterpretation of the results. Chapter IV details the research process as well as the research findings, including themes that emerge from the data. Chapter IV also addresses the research questions presented in previous chapters. Chapter V contains a summary of the entire research process including the objective, focus, methodology, information gathering process, as well as research findings. Following this is a discussion of those findings, conclusions drawn, and a discussion of implications for future research.

CHAPTER II

LITERATURE REVIEW

In this qualitative study, I examined teacher perceptions of collegial collaboration in the academy structure. Specifically, I interviewed teachers who have experience in both a non-academy and academy structure at the same school. I formulated the following research questions after review of existing literature and identification of gaps in that literature:

1. How do teachers perceive their experiences with collegial collaboration in a traditional school setting prior to adopting the academy model?
2. How do teachers perceive their experiences with collegial collaboration after adopting the academy model?

I organized my review of the literature into two sections. The first provides a history and evolution of career and technical education in the United States. The second discusses the extant research on teacher collaboration. The chapter ends with a brief summary of the findings from my literature review.

At the beginning of the 21st century, mainstream media sources drew attention to the issue of high school graduates' lack of preparedness for the current job market. The *Washington Post* featured an article in which the author stated that two-fifths of high school students graduate prepared neither for traditional college nor for career training (Brennan, 2001). The author also suggests that high school needs reimagining to address

students' needs for both college and careers and that this can be achieved through a structure that utilizes small learning communities (SLCs) or academies. The academy model has emerged as a potential design to shape the high school experience, introducing more relevance for students while also serving to reimagine teaching and learning through the lens of the teacher.

Vocational and Career Education in the United States

The earliest appearances of vocational and career education occurred in the 1800s when a group of wealthy businessmen in New York established the New York Public School Society. During this time, schools were divided by social class with vocational, or trade, education being the focus for the working-class while the wealthy students focused on academic instruction (Gordon, 2014).

It was not until the United States was well into the Industrial Revolution that demand for skilled workers increased significantly and caused a new type of secondary school to come into existence. In a continued effort to staff the booming factories, these schools focused on skills, trades, and manual labor rather than academics (Brennan, 2001). Part of this model was to steer the education of non-college-bound graduates to vocational training, such as automotive manufacturing or carpentry, each being a much-needed vocation in the growing economy.

While this vocational education addressed the needs of the manufacturing world, it did not address what some saw as a great need in the United States: the need for higher quality education. The 1960s would see a push from the federal government, via Presidents Kennedy and Johnson, for education funding via the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) of 1965. In addition to the shift in funding toward

education, there was also a redirection of federal focus. Previous efforts focused on preparation for the workforce, but the new focus was a move toward equalizing opportunities for poor students (Kantor, 1991).

The 1960s were fraught with social and political upheaval that also impacted public education. The economic pressures of the Vietnam War affected the injection of federal funding into public schools. The beginning of the war happened to coincide with a large tax cut, after which the government diverted what funds were available to build the United States' military force (Labonte & Levit, 2006). Both government funding and attention devoted to issues of the common good, like public education, waned due to the escalating social issues in America surrounding their involvement in the Vietnam War (DiNuzzo, 2017). Throughout the decade of the 1960s and continuing to the end of the 1970s, the effects of the lack of government attention and oversight became evident in the form of the lowest test scores in decades for American public-school students (Brennan, 2001). In response to this, and in an effort to hold public schools accountable for student achievement, the next four decades would see education policy in the United States move toward standards, assessment, accountability, and school-wide reform (Bodilly, Glennan, Kerr & Galegher, 2004).

The 1980s began with the election of President Ronald Reagan and public education was thrust back into the spotlight with the publication of *A Nation at Risk*. This government report described a "rising tide of mediocrity" in education and the topic was once again at the top of the national agenda (National Commission on Excellence in Education, 1983). Versions of reforms would follow in the form of No Child Left Behind (NCLB) in 2001, Race to the Top and Common Core in 2009, and the Every

Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) in 2015 (Education Policy: A Timeline, 2018). Borek (2008) wrote that *A Nation at Risk* focused on four problematic categories in education—content, expectations, time, and teaching.

When addressing content, the commission called for a greater emphasis on specific content courses (English, math, science, social studies, computer science, and foreign language) which left little room for technical and occupational skills. The commission stated that both schools and parents should have high expectations for students rather than the current minimum one and the “ideal of academic excellence as the primary goal of schooling [seemed to be] fading across the board in American education” (p. 14). The commission also called for a lengthened school day and school year in addition to recommending how teachers spent this additional time. The recommendation made in the report concerning teachers included making their salaries competitive and ensuring that teachers demonstrate “competence in an academic discipline” (p. 30). This lays the foundation for the concepts of performance-based pay for teachers and an increase in teacher accountability, measured in terms of student achievement (Borek, 2008).

This governmental focus on education continued into the 1990s when states materials, to outcome-based measures including standardized test proficiency (Hurst, Tan, Meek, & Sellers, 2003). Along with increased school and teacher accountability, came more strict graduation requirements, standards-based education, and a teacher licensure test - many of these the result of new education law titled No Child Left Behind (NCLB), enacted in 2002. A catalyst for education reform was the perception that American public schools were no longer leading internationally, instead, they were

ranking in the bottom half in math, science, and reading when compared to 33 other developed countries based on the PISA (Programme for International Student Assessment) rankings in 2000 (Ray & Margaret, 2003). From this realization grew the need for continued education reform. NCLB, the fifth reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, was a far-reaching, bipartisan, government education initiative signed into law by President G. W. Bush in 2002. NCLB sought to close the achievement gap between lower socioeconomic and minority students and their more advantaged peers (Gray, 2004).

The primary objective of NCLB was to raise the achievement of all students, and particularly to close the academic performance gap between majority students and minority students; some viewed this as an effort to squeeze vocational education and CTE offerings out of the current high school curriculum (Fletcher, 2006). In the early 1990s, vocational education had become a type of dumping ground for students who struggled in the traditional academic environment; this included a lot of students with behavior problems as well as students with disabilities and was seen as a way to prepare these students for immediate entry into the labor market (Hanford, 2014; Malkus, 2019). With such an emphasis on remedial work in reading, writing, and mathematics, school schedules were reorganized. Many elective offerings, including those in vocational education, were less prominent offerings for students. Though shortsighted, the focus of No Child Left Behind on the reading, writing, and math and preparation of every student to pursue college-level work, caused a near-death experience for vocational education.

Significant pushback from those outside the college-for-all thinking turned attention to a more inclusive college and career agenda for public education. With that

development, vocational education reemerged as Career and Technical Education (CTE). With the new requirements of NCLB, CTE now had a dual mission of preparing students for both the workplace and for higher education, which included colleges and technical schools (Fletcher, 2006). The existence of NCLB continued a trend of change for Career and Technical Education that had been going on for years.

According to a study by Hanford (2014), in 1990, only 10% of students who took four or more occupational course (CTE) credits in high school also completed the courses they needed to attend college; this had not been in line with the newly introduced NCLB. In fact, many of these CTE programs would eventually close down due to poor performance as measured by the new mandates. Over the next ten years, enrollment in CTE programs would decline by more than 25% (Malkus, 2019). The decline in training programs would have a ripple effect and the United States would see a skilled worker shortage in the mid-2000s (Whyte & Greene, 2006; Malkus, 2019). In 2005, the destruction left behind by Hurricane Katrina threw this shortage into the national spotlight and experts predicted it would take more than ten years to rebuild due to a predicted shortage of more than 80,000 skilled workers annually (Whyte & Greene, 2006). This deficiency affected the country for several years as CTE programs went through the slow process to overhaul vocational education in order to provide education that would make sure all students were career *and* college ready (Hanford, 2014). A reinjection of funds via the Carl D. Perkins grant was partially to thank for the emergence of CTE as a viable option.

Originally passed at the Vocational Education Act of 1963, Perkins funding would go through several iterations in the following years. First called the Carl D.

Perkins Act in 1984, it focused on vocational programs and those students who were denied proper vocational training. Revisions to the funding act in 1990 and 1998 targeted the mission of bringing the nation's workforce up to par with the complex world of technology. Finally, in 2018, Perkins once again shifted its focus to CTE (Wang, 2009). State legislation in 2018 mirrored this pendulum swing back to a focus on Career and Technical Education. Not only was Perkins funding once again moving to CTE, but 85 state and local legislatures passed CTE-related bills, more than any other education issue besides teaching (Malkus, 2019). After a successful rebranding, CTE shed the negative connotations of vocational education and is now widely seen as a viable path for students who may be poorly served by the college-for-all culture (Malkus, 2019).

Research on the Career Academy Model

Career and Technical Education (CTE) evolved from what scholars and practitioners previously referred to as Vocational Education (Fletcher, 2006). The CTE name change also acknowledged that work had come to include not only mechanical and hands-on labor but also more technical/technologically driven and service-based work involving career pathways rather than entry into a single job (Hodge & Dougherty, 2020). This shift in focus led to the CTE model sharing a greater number of characteristics with the current Career Academy, where students are in career tracks and their classes have connections to the local industry.

Some form of the Academy Model has been present in high schools across the United States since as early as 1969, starting with Edison High School in Philadelphia. Despite not being continuously sustained in its original form, this structure has continued to evolve. The current structure of academy schools first appeared in California where

the University of California at Berkeley issued a Planning Guide for Career Academies in 2001 (Dayton, 2010). The guide included scenarios where academy models were successful as well as those where there were not. It also included a schedule of planning tasks, roles, and responsibilities of various stakeholders as well as recommendation for how to measure progress and where to find support. In 2005, the Florida legislature passed legislation mandating that all public schools in the state have at least one career academy in place for the 2008-2009 school year (Dixon et al., 2011). Florida based its models on UC Berkley's Career Academy National Standards of Practice, which described Career Academies as small learning communities with a college-preparatory curriculum centered on a career theme.

Even the federal government supported the implementation of the Career Academy structure via grants when the U.S. Department of Education introduced a program called the Smaller Learning Community plan, which aimed to support schools in the implementation of smaller learning community structures. Although the program funding ended early in 2010, it funded grants to nearly 1,350 U.S. high schools. This forerunner to career academies showed evidence of an increase in student involvement in extracurricular activities, increases in passage rates from ninth to tenth grade, and an increase in the number of students planning to attend a two or four-year college after graduation (Bernstein, Millsap, Schimmenti, & Page, 2008).

In order for the widespread adoption of the career academy structure to be attractive to educators and policymakers alike, research and evidence of the benefits to graduates and the job markets they enter were used to aid in making the case. The majority of research that exists on Career Academies focuses on student achievement

within and after graduation from the academy structure. Kemple and Willner (2008) outlined the relationship between career academies and labor markets, educational goals, and transitions to adulthood. They evaluated the outcomes based on data obtained from tracking students in the eight years following their high school graduation. The selected schools were required to have partnerships with industry employers who helped design the curriculum and provided work-based learning experiences for students. Kemple and Willner focused on job attainment, job retention, hourly wages, and the number of hours worked. All showed statistically significant positive differences when compared to non-career academy schools. While Kemple and Willner did not focus on other factors such as attendance, discipline, and graduation rate, they identified three necessary factors for a small learning community to classify as a Career Academy. These were the organization of the schools into small learning communities, typically serving 150 to 200 students, a curriculum organized around a career, occupation, or industry, and the availability of work-based experiences.

Castellano et al. (2017) examined achievement outcomes for students who graduated from a high school with an academy structure and found that students who completed programs of study (POS) had higher GPAs, and earned more STEM credits than non-POS graduates earn. Stipanovic, Stringfield, and Witherell (2017) looked beyond student achievement outcomes, comparing the self-efficacy among academy and non-academy students. They found students who belonged to an academy put forth greater effort in courses, had a greater desire to be challenged, and had greater motivation to attend school.

There is some debate among researchers about the impact of the career academy

structure on measures such as attendance, discipline, and graduation rate. However, included in Kemple and Snipe's (2000) planning guide for the academy structure were data including the fact that career academy students attended school more regularly, earned more course credits, were more likely to participate in extracurricular activities and volunteer projects, and were less likely to be arrested. Dropout rates for the high-risk subgroup decreased from 32 percent in the control group to 21 percent among the academy students (Kemple & Snipes, 2000).

One cannot forget the advantages for teachers in the academy structure. Kemple noted that academy teachers indicated they have more opportunities to collaborate with colleagues and to influence decisions in key areas of their work. He also showed career academy teachers express higher levels of job satisfaction, are more likely to indicate they are part of a strong teacher learning community, and emphasized personalized attention for their students more than non-academy teachers (Kemple, 1997).

The career academy structure has continued to gain credibility in recent years, with districts in California and Tennessee leading the way. As of 2019, scholars estimate there are 7,000 career academies in existence in the United States with a student enrollment of more than one million students (National Career Academy Coalition, 2019). The partnerships formed between businesses and school districts shape the paths and goals of these programs.

Ford Next Generation Learning

In 2005, Metro Nashville Public High Schools (MNPS) were experiencing an onslaught of student truancy, disruptive student behavior, and the imminent threat of a state takeover (Gilly, 2017). In an effort to transform their schools and student outcomes,

MNPS partnered with the Nashville Area Chamber of Commerce, Alignment Nashville, PENCIL (an education-related non-profit), and Ford Motor Company to develop a new school model.

Through this partnership, Ford Next Generation Learning (NGL) works with school districts to transition or create academy schools in these areas. Since its inception, Ford NGL has expanded into a network of 307 high schools containing 541 academies in 30 communities with over 345,000 students enrolled (Ford Next Generation Learning, 2017). Mike Schmidt, Director of Education and Global Community Development for the Ford Motor Company Fund, stated the focus of Ford NGL continues to be partnerships with schools and their communities to support “long-term, transformational change” (Ford Next Generation Learning, 2017).

This model focused on three strands of transformation: the transformation of teaching and learning, the transformation of the secondary school experience, and the transformation of business and civic engagement. Transformation of teaching is a part of this structure that requires intentional scheduling on the part of the school administration to allow for meaningful professional collaboration between teachers. A 2014 report states that in order for the school model to support productive teacher collaboration there must be dedicated time within the school day for common planning time and/or professional learning communities, both of which are present in the Ford NGL academy model (Caskey & Carpenter, 2014).

Teacher Collaboration

Much research exists regarding the broad topic of teacher collaboration, for which many names exist. Terms such as collegiality, professional learning communities,

teacher teaming, teacher collaboration, and professional networks describe what can still be a vague concept in education (Vangrieken, Dochy, Raes, & Kyndt, 2015). Friend and Cook (1992) listed the defining characteristics of successful collaboration as 1) being voluntary, 2) requiring parity among participants, 3) being based on mutual goals, 4) depending on shared responsibility for participation and decision making, 5) sharing of resources, and 6) having shared accountability for outcomes (Friend & Cook, 1992). A report released by the U.S. Department of State more concisely defined collaboration as taking place when members of an inclusive learning community work together as equals to assist students to succeed in the classroom (Powell, 2007). Both definitions provide some insight into what professional collaboration may look like in the world of education, but perhaps rather than focusing on the definition, the focus should be on the impact effective professional collaboration can have on students and teachers.

Researchers have found higher levels of student achievement, specifically in math and reading, for those students whose teachers who had participated in quality collaboration (Goddard et al., 2007; Seashore-Louis et al., 2010; Ronfeldt et al., 2015). Teachers believe that collaboration improves their ability to teach subject content, improves teaching methods, improves teachers' ability to manage students, and provides benefits to teachers in general (Moore, 2009).

The relationship between teacher collaboration and teacher effectiveness has also been shown to be important. As many as thirty years ago, teacher professional collaboration was found to be profoundly effective in improving teachers' efficacy and enhancing teachers' effectiveness (Pounder, 1999; Rosenholtz, 1989; Shachar & Shmuelewitz, 1997). Positive impacts of teacher collaboration also include the finding

that when first-year teachers have the opportunity to collaborate on instructional practices they are less likely to leave the profession or transfer to another school (Kardos & Johnson, 2007; Youngs et al., 2001). This is especially significant at a time when up to 20% of new teachers leave the profession within two years and up to 50% leave within the first five to seven years (Hughes, 2012; Curran, Viano, & Fisher, 2019).

Additional benefits of professional teacher collaboration that have been found are improved attitudes toward teaching (Brownell, Yeager, Rennells, & Riley, 1997), higher job satisfaction (Pounder, 1999), and higher levels of trust in principals and colleagues (Tschannen-Moran, 2001). During the 2011-2012 and 2012-2013 school years, a study of 9,000 teacher participants took place in the Miami-Dade County school system. This study included teacher observations over the two academic years as well as teacher surveys related to school climate, leadership, and supports for teaching. Researchers found that almost 90% of respondents indicated their collaboration was “helpful” (39%) or “very helpful” (49%). This same report found that teachers benefitted from quality collaboration within their school even if they did not directly contribute to the collaboration themselves (Ronfeldt et al., 2015).

While this information supports the concept of professional collaboration, it is important to note that certain conditions are prerequisites for collaboration to be effective. Collaboration focused on instruction and assessment is perceived as the most helpful and extensive (Ronfeldt et al., 2015). Frequency, structure, and intensity of the interactions are also essential characteristics of effective professional teacher collaboration (Goddard et al., 2007). One model for collaboration that includes structures for these aspects is that of the Professional Learning Community.

Professional Learning Communities (PLCs)

In 1983, the National Commission on Excellence in Education released a report titled *A Nation at Risk*. The commission described the U.S. education system as having “lost sight of the basic purposes of schooling, and of the high expectations and disciplined effort needed to attain them” (National Commission of Excellence in Education, 1983, p. 3). Because of this report, there was an immediate and drastic wave of education initiatives aimed at reforming the U.S. public education system. Those reforms aimed to improve four areas identified in the report: content, expectations, time, and teaching (Borek, 2003). The area of teaching saw more stringent certification processes, competency testing, and elaborate teacher evaluation systems (Chubb, 1988).

To support teachers through these changes, some schools developed a team approach in which teachers functioned as a team rather than functioning as a hierarchy. While criticizing the current wave of school reforms, Chubb noted this characteristic as one that occurred in many effective schools (1988). He specified that while these schools had perceived strong leadership, the “decision making [was] significantly more democratic” (p. 34) and teachers worked more effectively with each other due to shared knowledge of students and content (Chubb, 1988). These findings are echoed in the 2017 NTC practice brief which states when teachers are involved in the decision-making process related to school improvement planning and student conduct policies, students learn more (New Teacher Center, 2017).

In 1989, Rosenholtz conducted a study of 78 schools in eight districts in Tennessee and found that “learning enriched schools” featured “collective commitments to student learning in collaborative settings” and it was assumed that teaching was a

collective practice rather than an individual one (All Things PLC, 2013). Shared norms and beliefs, collaborative culture, ongoing inquiry, mutual support and obligation, and collective decision-making were all characteristics that appeared in various scholarly research on the topic of professional collaboration (Darling-Hammond, 1996; Hord, 2004; Little & McLaughlin, 1993; Louis & Kruse, 1995).

DuFour and Eaker (1998) categorized these common characteristics into six categories that demonstrate a positive relationship with student learning. They are a shared mission, vision and values; collective inquiry; collaborative teams; action orientation and experimentation; continuous improvement; and results orientation (DuFour & Eaker, 1998). According to All Things PLC, DuFour and Eaker's 1988 publication of *Professional Learning Communities at Work: Best Practices from Enhancing Student Achievement* was the catalyst for advancing the PLC concept from a "secondary whisper" to "a major rallying cry".

Research by Morris in 2011 examined how teachers perceive a PLC's impact on teacher collaboration, teacher practice, and student achievement. While quantitative data did not establish a direct impact on student achievement, quantitative data did find that all teachers involved in the study perceived his or her participation in a PLC had a positive impact on teacher collaboration. An additional theme that emerged is a higher level of teacher self-efficacy among those who participated in a PLC than those who did not (Morris, 2011).

Teacher self-efficacy is a teacher's belief and confidence in his or her ability to promote student learning (Hawkins, 2009). Extensive research exists on how teacher self-efficacy (or collective teacher efficacy [CTE]) correlates with student achievement.

For example, research by Bandura (1997) found the positive effects of CTE on student academic performance more than outweigh the negative effects of low socioeconomic status. Work that is more recent echoes these findings through research on the effect size of CTE, which ranked number two on a list of 195 effects related to student achievement (Hattie, 2015).

Focusing exclusively on how PLCs impact teacher retention, a mixed-method study of recent graduates found that 100% of participants felt their PLC met or highly met their goals and 100% of participants would continue their involvement in their PLC (Waters, 2019). However, it is not enough for PLCs to exist in name only; structures must be in place that allow PLCs to have the time and support to function effectively. Darling-Hammond and Richardson (2009) state that efforts to develop professional learning communities bump up against individualistic norms and school structures that sharply limit time for collaborative planning and that smaller school (learning community) size and common planning time were key.

While each of the characteristics has been described as essential for a PLC to be effective, my study focused on the singular characteristic of collaboration. Specifically, it focused on teacher perceptions regarding professional teacher collaboration in a traditional school structure versus those same experiences in an academy structure. The school included in this study is part of the Ford Next Generation Learning academy structure, of which PLCs are a strategic piece.

Summary of Literature Review

In this chapter, I provided a brief primer of the development and history of vocational and career and technical education, the current career academy structure, and

teacher collaboration. The referenced vocational and career and technical education share characteristics, such as career tracks and connections with local business partners, with the career academy structure found in many high schools today (Applied Educational Systems, 2020). The Ford Next Generation Learning group has advanced the initiative of the career academy structure in today's high schools.

One of the hallmark components of this structure is the implementation of Professional Learning Communities. Much research exists on how effective PLCs have a positive and direct relationship with student achievement. While research suggests that effective PLCs increase positive student performance as well as teacher job satisfaction, it is essential that certain characteristics are present in order for them to have this influence (Goddard et al., 2007; Pounder, 1999; Seashore-Louis et al., 2010). The characteristic I focused on is teacher collaboration. While a broad research base exists on teacher collaboration in the traditional high school structure, I found that little research exists that explores teacher perceptions of effective collegial collaboration in the career academy structure.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

To investigate how the implementation of Career Academies influences teacher perception of collegial collaboration, I utilized a case study approach. The case study approach “is particularly useful to employ when there is a need to obtain an in-depth appreciation of an issue, event or phenomenon of interest, in its natural real-life context” (Crowe et al., 2011, p. 2). I used a purposeful sampling strategy, as described by Creswell and Poth (2018), to identify teachers who have experience in both structures at the same school in order to control for similarities and differences in teacher collaboration due to the school structure. The following research questions were the basis for this research:

1. How do teachers perceive their experiences with collegial collaboration in a traditional school setting prior to adopting the academy model?
2. How do teachers perceive their experiences with collegial collaboration in an academy setting after adopting the academy model?

Research Method and Design—Qualitative Case Study

In this section, I discuss the characteristics of qualitative research as well as why case study research was the appropriate research approach to use for my study. Denzin and Lincoln (2011) describe qualitative research as an approach that allows the researcher to make sense of a phenomenon in terms of the meanings that people bring them. Creswell and Poth (2017) describe five approaches to qualitative research.

The first of these approaches is narrative research in which the researcher analyzes lived experiences and stories told by subjects. Another is phenomenological research, which describes the common meaning of their lived experiences or a phenomenon. Next is grounded theory research, the intent of which is to generate a theory about a process or an action. Another is ethnographic research, in which a researcher develops a theory based on patterns of behavior, beliefs, and language that develops among a group of people who do not interact frequently. The last approach, which I utilized, is case-study research.

Case-study research is described as the study of a case (or cases) within a real-life, contemporary context or setting (Yin, 2014). While there are variations of case-study research, my approach utilized a single-case study with embedded units of analysis. In this case, I gathered information from multiple teachers at one high school. A graphic displaying the types of case-study research is included below (Figure 1). This style of case study was the most appropriate for my research because I am studying a number of teachers (embedded units of analysis) within a single school (case).

Figure 1. Yin's (2018) Typology of Case Study Design

Strengths and Limitations of Qualitative Case Studies

As a research method, case study research has its limitations. Scholars have acknowledged that case study research may have the perception of a lack of rigor and issues with generalizability (Yin, 2018; Creswell & Poth, 2018). Creswell and Poth (2018) detailed the challenges of selecting the appropriate case and, when using multiple cases, the correct number of cases. Yin (2018) described how case study research is often confused with other types of case studies such as teaching-practice case studies, popular case studies, and case records.

Case study research also has its strengths, one of those being that the researcher investigates the subject within the context of its use rather than removing the subject from their environment (Yin, 2018). This is opposed to an experiment, which isolates a phenomenon from its context and instead focuses on a limited number of variables (Zaidah, 2003). Another strength of case study research is the ability to inform further

research, and different forms of research, on the studied phenomenon (Noor, 2008; Yin, 2018).

Context of the Study

The research setting was a public high school in Lexington, Kentucky in its third year of Career Academy implementation. At the time the data was gathered, Bryan Station High School had a student population of approximately 1,400 students in grades nine through twelve. The school had approximately 100 full-time teachers, 6 academy principals, 6 academy counselors, an academy coach, and an executive principal. Bryan Station High School began the transition to academies in the 2016-2017 school year with the implementation of the Freshman Academy. It became the first high school in Lexington to implement the career academy structure fully in the 2017-2018 school year with the addition of four career academies.

At Bryan Station High School, all ninth-grade students enter the Freshman Academy where they begin to explore academies and pathways as they relate to college and career plans. The Freshman Academy structure seeks to support both academic and non-academic outcomes. Tenth, eleventh, and twelfth graders are part of one of four career academies at Bryan Station High School. These are Leadership, Information and Technology, Engineering and Robotics, and Medical. Within each academy, there are at least three pathways, culminating in a unique career certification or end-of-program assessment. Completion fulfills the state requirements to deem the student transition ready.

An important hallmark of the career academy structure is the effective implementation of teacher Professional Learning Communities (PLC) and/or teacher

Small Learning Communities (SLC). These groups engage in an ongoing process to support students behaviorally and academically, resulting in better student achievement (Hoagland et al., 2014). Based on content areas, PLCs address topics such as subject-specific material, student concerns at the content level, and district mandates as they pertain to each instructional area. Based at the academy level, SLCs address broader topics such as student concerns across academic subjects, behavior, and attendance, academy wide concepts, and cross-curricular collaboration. Hoagland et al. (2014) provide evidence of the intentional nature of this design, finding that the difference between collaboration in professional learning communities and collaboration in other cooperative teams is that PLCs exist for a specific purpose. In the school that serves as the context of my study, time is devoted to these teacher-learning communities in the form of both PLCs and SLCs.

Research studies reveal the importance of professional collaboration and its positive association with student learning and positive perceptions among teachers (Ketterlin-Geller et al., 2015; Goddard et al., 2007; Ronfeldt et al., 2015; Seashore-Louis et al., 2010). Given the increasing popularity of the Academy structure, research focusing on collegial collaboration in PLCs and SLCs specifically within the academy structure is scarce. The field lacks information on how teachers perceive the impact of this structure on their ability to engage in meaningful, effective professional collaboration. The findings will be important to support the continued implementation of both effective collegial collaboration and the academy structure.

Data Sources

In this study, I will draw from three sources of data. The first of these will be a teacher survey administered by the Academies of Lexington to all three high schools in FCPS that participate in the academy structure. I will draw information specifically from the high school that serves as the context of this study. The second will be survey data collected by means of a state-administered instrument known as the TELL survey. The third will be data collected by means of group-level assessments (GLAs). Below I discuss each of these data sources in detail.

Teacher Survey

Annually, the Academies of Lexington administrative team administers a survey to teachers at the three academy high schools within FCPS (See Appendix A). The questions on the survey for the 2018-2019 school year addressed topics such as the effectiveness of school-level SLCs, project-based learning, industry participation/business engagement, communication, and professional development. On an annual basis, the Academies of Lexington leadership team edits the survey.

TELL Kentucky Survey

An additional source of data relative to the perception of collegial collaboration is the Teaching, Empowering, Leading, and Learning (TELL) Kentucky Survey. The TELL Survey is administered every other year to assess whether educators across the state report having access to resources and supports which are necessary to facilitate effective teaching (New Teacher Center [NTC], 2013a). The utilization of this information at the state and district level informs educational policy and practice

designed to improve working conditions for educators and learning conditions for students (Prichard Committee, 2013).

The TELL Kentucky Survey originates from work completed by the North Carolina Professional Teaching Standards Commission (NCPTSC). A review of literature and analyses of both state and national survey data from the National Center for Education Statistics' School and Staffing Survey identified five areas as factors that contribute to teacher satisfaction and teacher retention. These areas are (a) time, (b) empowerment, (c) leadership, (d) decision making, and (e) facilities and resources (New Teacher Center, 2013b).

The New Teacher Center (NTC) used this information to design the TELL survey, focusing on areas linked to student behavior support, community support, and instructional practices and support. The current TELL survey includes the following eight constructs:

- time,
- facilities and resources,
- community support and involvement,
- managing student conduct,
- teacher leadership,
- school leadership,
- professional development, and
- instructional practices and support (NTC, 2013b).

The current TELL Survey is administered on a biennial basis and offers every certified educator in Kentucky the opportunity to provide input on teaching conditions to

inform school, district, and state improvements (TELL, n.d.). As part of my study, I will examine results for Bryan Station High School from both 2015 and 2017, one year prior to and one year after the implementation of the academy structure, respectively (See Appendices F and G).

Validity and Reliability. In this section, I will describe the efforts utilized by the NTC to demonstrate the validity and reliability of information gathered related to the relationship between teaching and learning conditions and student learning and teacher retention. As part of the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation sponsored MET (Measuring Effective Teachers) Project, Swanlund was able to conduct an external survey review of data gathered from 286,835 educators from 11 states across the U.S. (2011). These analyses identified patterns in the data that provide a clear structure for the survey and confidence for interpreting the results (NTC, 2013b).

Swanlund conducted validity testing in order to ensure the survey accurately measures what it intended to measure. The method used for the TELL survey prompted edits including the introduction of the four-point rating scale as well as identifying survey items that overlapped over multiple constructs. Swanlund conducted reliability testing to establish that the survey is capable of producing consistent results across participants groups (NTC, 2013b).

NTC regularly conducts internal analyses to ensure validity and reliability to verify the stability of the survey instruments across populations as promoted by industry standards found in the Standards for Educational and Psychological Testing (American Educational Research Association, American Psychological Association, and National Council on Measurement in Education, 1999). This testing included data from 43,761

respondents out of a reported 50,500 school-based licensed educators in Kentucky, yielding a response rate of 87 percent. Respondents include several categories of educators: 88% are teachers, 5% are administrators, and 7% are other licensed educators such as librarians and school psychologists (NTC, 2013a).

The internal validity analyses measure the degree to which the survey questions measure the eight constructs they intend to measure. NTC utilized factor analysis to group variables with similar characteristics and then performed confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) and varimax rotation procedures to verify the actual structure of the data reflected the expected structure of the previous validity studies. For the CFA, the researchers specified an eight-factor solution in which all factors have an eigenvalue greater than one. To confirm internal validity, the eight factors had to contribute at least ten percent of the variance. Researchers showed the eight factors together explained 64% of the variance, thus proving internal validity (NTC, 2013b). This means the TELL Kentucky survey can be generalized and can be expected to produce similar results across similar populations.

Internal reliability analyses produced Cronbach's alpha coefficients between 0.86 and 0.95 for each of the eight survey constructs. The closer an alpha coefficient is to 1.0 the greater the internal consistency of the items on the scale (NTC, 2013b). According to Field (2013), alpha coefficients above 0.8 are acceptable to prove reliability. All eight alpha coefficients being above this 0.8 threshold confirms internal consistency. Together, the internal validity and reliability testing for the TELL Kentucky survey confirms the survey is generalizable and will produce similar results among similar populations (NTC, 2013b).

Group Level Assessment

I conducted a group level assessment (GLA) in order to understand how the participants perceived collegial collaboration in a traditional high school structure and an academy structure (See Appendix C). GLA is a method that allows a group of participants to generate responses collaboratively and interactively regarding relevant needs, judgments, and priorities on given topics (Vaughan & Lohmueller, 2014; Reddy, 1996). This method will allow the group to build a common research base through the co-identification of needs, priorities, and action plans (Vaughan, 2014).

Data Collection

Having described the three data sources—what will be collected from informants at the case study high school—I now turn my attention to how I will collect these data. As above, I will discuss the data collection procedures for each of the data sources. The first of these will be a teacher survey administered to all teachers within the three Academies of Lexington high schools. The second is the TELL survey, which is a biennial survey administered by the New Teacher Center to gather input on teaching conditions. I will use the results from the 2015 and 2017 administrations of the survey, a year before and a year after the implementation of the academy structure. The third will be data collected from group-level assessments (GLAs), including the GLA protocol and timelines for data collection. Below I discuss each of these data sources in detail.

Teacher Survey

The Academies of Lexington (AoL) survey results are presented as an aggregate of all responses from a school and as responses from the three academy schools taken as a whole. This allows for the identification of both school and district level trends. In the

past, the AoL administered survey via a Google Form, and teacher emails were not collected, although information about the teachers' schools was included as survey questions. Results of the survey are shared exclusively with the leadership teams of the Academies of Lexington, district high school chiefs, and the superintendent. A full copy of the 2018-2019 survey is located in Appendix A.

TELL Survey

The TELL Survey is a biennial survey that offers every certified educator in Kentucky the opportunity to provide input on teaching conditions to inform school, district, and state improvements (TELL, n.d.). Participation is optional, identifying information is not assigned to the results, so responses remain anonymous. TELL Kentucky presents survey results as an aggregate of all responses from a school rather than on an individual teacher response level; this will allow identification of school-wide trends. Questions include topics such as time, teacher leadership, instructional support and practice, among others. According to the TELL website (2020), the survey is administered by the New Teacher Center (NTC) and its purpose is to support the development of an effective, dedicated, and inspired teaching force.

Group Level Assessment

I conducted the GLA administration through a series of steps that included 1) establishing trust, collaboration, and participation; 2) ideation; 3) gallery walk; 4) reflection; 5) coding and theme generation; and 6) selection and prioritization. The prompts which will be part of the GLA will be created based on the topic of teacher collaboration as well others generated from data gathered from multiple sources, such as results of an annual district-level teacher survey administered by Academies of Lexington

teacher survey and the TELL Survey results. Appendix B includes a detailed description and graphic detailing the GLA process.

Data Analysis

Teacher Surveys

I analyzed the results of the Academies of Lexington teacher survey utilizing descriptive analysis. I included frequency and percentage response distributions. When appropriate I included measures of central tendency (mean, median, and mode) as well as dispersion measures (range and standard deviation). I examined the results as a whole and isolated results from teachers at Bryan Station High School. I used the identified themes to help inform prompts that were used as part of the GLA.

TELL Surveys

The TELL Survey results were analyzed for comparisons between teacher perception of collegial collaboration both before and after the academy structure was put into place at Bryan Station High School. Examples of questions that examined were:

Q 2.1 Please rate how strongly you agree or disagree with the following statements about the use of time in your school.

b. Teachers have time available to collaborate with colleagues.

Q. 6.1 Please rate how strongly you agree or disagree with the following statements about teacher leadership in your school.

e. The faculty has an effective process for making group decisions to solve problems. (TELL, 2020)

The analysis of these results was performed utilizing the same methods as the AofL Survey results, frequency and percentage distributions, measures of central tendency, and

dispersion measures. A copy of the questions included in the 2017 administration of the TELL survey can be found in Appendix B. A full copy of 2017 results for Bryan Station High School is found in Appendix F, and a comparative report of the 2015 and 2017 administrations of the TELL survey can be found in Appendix G.

Group Level Assessment

To ascribe meaning to the information gathered in the GLA, I will use coding as a way of indexing or categorizing the text in order to establish a framework of thematic ideas about it (Gibbs, 2018). Once the GLA is completed, I will use both descriptive coding and in vivo coding in order to assign a single label to data with common themes (Saldaña, 2016). As described by Creswell (2017), this approach allows researchers to go through the data (e.g., GLA responses) and highlight significant statements, sentences, or quotes that provide an understanding of how the participants perceived the experience.

Ethical Considerations

Prior to participation in this study, I informed participants that I would not use any responses they provide for evaluative purposes. I also communicated that I would not share information with any person or entity and I would keep their responses confidential. I made it clear that participation is voluntary and I would not view declining to participate as negative in any way. This was necessary because I may be the direct supervisor for some participants. As both an ethical consideration to participants and an effort to ensure validity, I gave participants the option to complete a member check.

I am an administrator in the school that serves as the context of my study; therefore, it was important that I recognize the possibility that my position in the school

may affect participant responses. Participants could fear conflict if they believe I would find their responses unfavorable. They may have also feared the perception that they were not doing their jobs effectively if they did not report a high level of professional collaboration. I will mitigate this by removing all possible identifiers from the final research findings and communicating this practice to the participants.

I will also utilize the work of Milner (2007) to investigate myself as a researcher. I will continue to examine myself in relation to others -- in this case, the communities and people involved in (my) research -- and acknowledge the multiple roles, identities, and positions that the research participants bring to the process (Aldridge, 2003; Chapman, 2007; Ladson-Billings, 2000; Tillman, 2002; Milner, 2007). As I continued to explore relationships within an academy structure, I maintained an awareness of how biases and mindsets can affect perceptions of these relationships. In addition to this, I acknowledged how my background and experiences may shape my interpretations of information.

Utilizing Milner's questions will allow me as a researcher to acknowledge how my experiences (or lack of experiences) may affect my perceptions surrounding race and culture. Equally important may be the question that often follows Milner's prompts, "How do I know?" Engaging in this process will allow me to base my current perceptions of authentic experiences rather than generalizations or assumptions. This awareness will allow me to be as realistic and impartial as possible and produce results that are accurate and reliable.

As it is a requirement for human subject research, I completed CITI training on November 11, 2018. Additionally, I obtained informed consent from all subjects; a

sample is located in Appendix D. I worked with my chair to refine and finalize the informed consent that I used in my research process.

Ensuring Credibility, Transferability, Dependability, and Confirmability

As a qualitative researcher, I must strive to satisfy the four criteria of trustworthiness (credibility, transferability, dependability, and confirmability). I ensured credibility by using methods triangulation to check the consistency of the data from the three data sources, as well as sharing the data, interpretations, and conclusions with the participants. Following Lincoln and Guba's (1985) recommendation, I provided a "thick" description of my experiences during data collection. Specifically, I included explicit connections to the cultural and social contexts that surrounded my data collection (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). This allowed me to provide proof of transferability by providing evidence that my study's findings have the potential for application to other contexts, such as other schools. In order to establish dependability, I had a fellow researcher who is familiar with the academy structure, but not specifically Bryan Station, review my data findings to ensure accuracy. I included information about this additional researcher when I made my submission to IRB. Finally, I ensured confirmability by establishing an audit trail. That is, I detailed my data sources, my data collection methods, and how I analyzed the data.

Summary

The goal of this chapter was to outline the research methods that I used to answer my research questions. Here, I have provided a discussion of the research methods/design, context of the study, procedures, data collection and analysis, and the ethical consideration of my study, including the process by which I explored my

positionality as a researcher. In Chapter IV, I provide an in-depth analysis of the results and the implementation of research methods and design outlined in this chapter.

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

The purpose of my qualitative study was to learn how teachers describe and perceive collegial collaboration in traditional and academy settings. As part of this process, I collected information about the structures and supports teachers perceive as vital to effective collaboration in either setting. In this chapter, I detail the findings of this case study research design. I present the analysis of my various data sources to the end of answering each of my research questions, which were:

1. How do teachers perceive their experiences with collegial collaboration in a traditional school setting prior to adopting the academy model?
2. How do teachers perceive their experiences with collegial collaboration in an academy setting after adopting the academy model?

I divided this chapter into six sections, three of which highlight coded themes and subcategories, which detail what each data source revealed about the theme. The work of Saldaña (2016) informed the selection and analysis of the following deductive codes: Collaboration, Communication, and Time.

The data sources I utilized in this study included results from the 2020 administration of the Academies of Lexington Teacher Survey, the 2015 and 2017 results from the TELL Kentucky Survey, and a Group Level Assessment with teacher participants. I analyzed the survey data utilizing Python software to produce descriptive

statistics including frequency and percentage distributions, measures of central tendency, and dispersion measures. I also undertook a comparative analysis of the 2015 and 2017 TELL Kentucky Survey results by examining questions pertaining to teacher collaboration and comparing responses before and after the implementation of the academy structure at the school that served as the context for my case study research design. I analyzed the GLA results using descriptive coding and in vivo coding in order to assign a single label to data with common themes (Saldaña, 2016).

Bryan Station High School: A High School that Transitioned to an Academy Model

Bryan Station High School is one of three high schools in Fayette County Public Schools (FCPS), located in Lexington, Kentucky. Bryan Station began the transition from a traditional high school structure to an academy structure in the 2016-2017 school year, beginning with the implementation of the Freshman Academy and adding four career academies the following school year. The four career academies include The Academy of Engineering, Manufacturing, and Robotics (EMR), The Academy of Information Technology (IT), The Academy of Leadership and Professional Services (Leadership), and The Academy of Medical Sciences (Medical). Each of the career academies contains career pathways designed around career paths that are under the umbrella of the academy focus.

Teacher Profiles

The participants included in each data source are (or were) teachers at Bryan Station High School. While Fayette County Public Schools does contain two other academy high schools, my research focuses on only teachers at Bryan Station. The TELL Kentucky Survey results were generated by teachers at Bryan Station from 2015 and

2017; one year before and one year after the implementation of the academy structure, respectively. All GLA participants work at Bryan Station High School currently. Due to the selection criteria used, all have only four years of experience teaching in the academy model, all four being at Bryan Station. Participant teaching experience in the non-academy model could have occurred at Bryan Station or another non-academy school (Table 1).

Table 1. Demographic Information of GLA Participants

<i>Participant</i>	<i>Race</i>	<i>Gender</i>	<i>Academy</i>	<i>Content Area</i>	<i>Total Years</i>	<i>Years in Traditional Model</i>	<i>Years in Academy Model</i>
Teacher A	White	Female	Medical	Math	11	7	4
Teacher B	White	Female	Leadership	Science	12	8	4
Teacher C	White	Female	Medical	ELL	17	13	4
Teacher D	White	Female	EMR	English	10	6	4
Teacher E	White	Male	Freshman	English	11	7	4
Teacher F	Black	Female	Freshman	Math	15	11	4
Teacher G	Black	Female	Leadership	SS	14	10	4
Teacher H	White	Female	IT	Math	11	8	4
Teacher I	White	Female	Leadership	English	5	1	4
Teacher J	White	Female	IT	Science	12	8	4

Teacher Perceptions of Collegial Collaboration Prior to the Academy Model

Now I will address the first of my research questions drawing upon the following data sources: the TELL Kentucky Survey results from 2015 and 2017 and a digital Group Level Assessment. First, I will draw upon survey data specific to the topic of collaboration prior to the implementation of the academy structure. Then I will examine

responses to a GLA prompt that focused on teacher perception of their experiences with collegial collaboration prior to the adoption of the academy structure.

Evidence from TELL Kentucky Survey

The TELL Kentucky Survey was administered to the teachers at Bryan Station High School in the spring of 2015, one year prior to the implementation of the academy structure. It was reported that Bryan Station had a 100% response rate for this administration while all of Fayette County Schools and all Kentucky high schools had response rates of 89% and 86%, respectively. For the purpose of my study, I focused on questions and sub-questions related specifically to teacher collaboration. Those questions were Q2.1b, Q2.2b, Q6.1e, Q8.1k, Q9.1d, and Q9.1E. I also examined questions related to teacher retention and overall school culture; those were Q10.1 and Q10.6. A complete copy of the 2017 TELL Kentucky Survey questions can be found in Appendix F.

Table 2. 2015 TELL Kentucky Survey Responses

<i>Question</i>	<i>Strongly disagree</i>	<i>Disagree</i>	<i>Agree</i>	<i>Strongly Agree</i>
Q2.1b	24	40	29	6
Q6.1e	17	39	39	6
Q8.1k	5	30	57	8
Q9.1d	9	9	61	22
Q9.1e	6	22	62	10

<i>Question</i>	<i>None</i>	<i>Less than or equal to 1 hour</i>	<i>More than 1 hour but less than or equal to 3 hours</i>	<i>More than 3 hours but less than or equal to 5 hours</i>	<i>More than 5 hours but less than or equal to 10 hours</i>	<i>More than 10 hours</i>
Q2.2b	21	57	18	4	0	0

Notes. Data are given in percent of respondents who indicated each category; percentages are rounded to the nearest percent.

In response to question 2.1b “Teachers have time available to collaborate with colleagues”, 64% of teachers responded Strongly Disagree or Disagree with that statement. Similarly, in response to question 2.2b “Collaborative planning time” 78% of teachers indicated they spent between 0 and 1 hour per week on collaborative planning. Finally, 55% of teachers responded Strongly Disagree or Disagree to question 6.1e, “The faculty has an effective process for making group decisions to solve problems”. Thus, before the transition to an academy school, many teachers felt their time available for collaboration was insufficient.

Responses to additional questions on collaboration revealed that, although many teachers felt collaboration time was insufficient, they still saw value in professional learning opportunities. In response to question 8.1k, “Professional learning provides ongoing opportunities for teachers to work with colleagues to refine teaching practices”, 65% of teachers responded Strongly agree or Agree. In response to question 9.1d (Teachers work in professional learning communities to develop and align instructional practices) and 9.1e (Provided supports ... translate to improvements in instructional practices by teachers), teachers responded Strongly Agree or Agree at rates of 83% and 82%, respectively.

Teachers reported a moderate level of satisfaction with BSHS as a place of work. 65% of teachers responded they planned to continue teaching at their current school (question 10.1) and 53% Strongly agreed or Agreed that BSHS was a good place to work and learn (question 10.6).

Evidence from Group Level Assessment

Ten teachers from The Academies of Bryan Station participated in a digital GLA. During this process, I asked them to consider the following prompt:

Based on your experiences, describe teacher collaboration in the non-academy setting. Please consider positives, negatives, structures, what worked, what was lacking, what supported or discouraged teacher collaboration, etcetera. The following themes and sub-themes below emerged when the GLA results were examined utilizing in vivo coding.

A complete copy of the information gathered during the digital GLA is located in Appendix H. I now discuss GLA results from Prompt 1, which specifically mention or allude to collaboration. First, I discuss responses that were the most common among participants. Then I discuss unique responses specific to collaboration prior to the academy model, which were shared by participants.

Collaboration. I isolated participant responses specific to collegial collaboration prior to the adoption of the career academy model (Table 3). Participants stated that while collaboration was present, it occurred almost exclusively with content areas and lacked structure. Five participants felt that collaboration depended on the department. Some indicated that their department functioned efficiently while others met solely to complete an assigned task and did not engage in authentic collaboration. One participant stated that collaboration lacked administrative support. Two stated collaboration within their content area lacked a clear structure or purpose. Participants also communicated a lack of structure and lack of administrative involvement in collaborative efforts.

Table 3. Responses Prompt 1 Specific to Collaboration Prior to the Adoption of the Academy Model

GLA Participant	Prompt 1 Responses Specific to Collaboration Prior to the Adoption of the Academy Model
A	Collaboration was mostly with similar content groups. We rarely talked to other departments.
B	Depended on if collaboration was within a topic or with IEP/504s. IEP/504 collaboration was in the dark.
C	More flexibility with my ability to work with teachers in various settings. Collab around EL was more authentic prior to the AM.
D	Collaboration typically occurred in PLCs. Admin didn't really care if it functioned. There seemed to always be confusion about the purpose of the PLC.
E	Before academies contents felt more on their own
F	There wasn't much collaboration before the AM, most teachers only talked about their common assessments in their department meetings.
H	It depended on your department, I have been in some that were very collaborative and some that people didn't care at all and just did their own thing.
J	Most collaboration was done in departments or PLCs. The effectiveness of those really depended on the individuals involved as there wasn't a standard for PLCs to which we were held accountable.

Communication. Participants indicated that prior to the adoption of the academy model communication lacked consistency across content areas. Participant E stated that most content areas were “on their own” and PLC planning was about what needed to be completed for the next unit or level without communication about vertical planning. Participant I stated that there were rarely student-centered conversations due to not having common students within PLCs. Participant J specifically documented a lack of productive reflection and discussion about instructional practices within the pre-academy model.

Time. Prompt 1 responses did not include references to time or lack of time.

Teacher Perception of Collegial Collaboration after Academy Model Adoption

Now I will address the second of my research questions drawing upon the following data sources: The Academies of Lexington Teacher Survey, the TELL Kentucky Survey results from 2015 and 2017 and a digital Group Level Assessment. First, I will draw upon survey data drawn specifically from the Academies of Lexington Teacher Survey. Then I will examine data from TELL Kentucky Survey. Finally, I will examine responses to a GLA prompt that focused on teacher perception of their experiences with collegial collaboration after the adoption of the academy structure.

Evidence from Academies of Lexington Teacher Survey

FCPS did not administer The Academies of Lexington Teacher Survey prior to the implementation of the academy model; therefore, there are no data, comparative or otherwise, which address collegial collaboration prior to the adoption of the academy model. However, the FCPS district administered this instrument after the implementation of the academy model in the district in 2016. In total, 170 out of 270 teachers across the

three academy high schools participated in the Academies of Lexington Survey at the conclusion of the 2019-2020 school year, this gave a response rate of 63% overall.

Response rates per school were: Bryan Station, 68%; Frederick Douglass, 51%, and Tates Creek, 68%. Participation numbers by school and academy can be found in Table 4.

Table 4. School and Academy Participation/Completion of Academies of Lexington Teacher Survey.

<i>School</i>	<i>Total</i>	<i>EMR</i>	<i>Leadership</i>	<i>IT</i>	<i>Medical</i>	<i>Freshman</i>
Bryan Station	66	19	12	11	17	7
Frederick Douglass	62	--	16	17	18	11
Tates Creek	42	11	9	--	8	14

Notes. Frederick Douglass does not have an academy in the EMR category and Tates Creek does not have an academy in IT category.

Two questions in the Academies of Lexington Teacher Survey specifically address teacher collaboration. These two questions were the focus of the descriptive analysis of the survey results. The questions were:

7. My SLC effectively collaborates for student learning.

25. The academy model provides adequate collaborative planning time.

Teachers were asked to respond to the questions using a Likert Scale of 1 to 4 with 1 representing “Strongly disagree” and 4 representing “Strongly agree”. I undertook a descriptive analysis of the results to determine the mean, median, and standard deviation reported by the school and by the academy. This information is displayed in Tables 5 and 6.

Responses to the Academies of Lexington Teacher Survey found that, in the three Academy high schools in Fayette County, most teachers felt their Academy was able to

collaborate effectively (Table 5). Means ranged from 3.67 (FDHS Freshman Academy) to a low of 2.64 (TCHC EMR Academy) indicating that, though some SLC's may be more efficient than others, most were regarded as a helpful collaborative tool. Standard deviations ranged from 0.47 (FDHD Freshman Academy) to 1.07 (BSHS Freshman Academy) indicating that some Academies had a higher variance in teacher response data.

Table 5. School and Academy Descriptive Analysis Results, Question 7

<i>School</i>		<i>EMR</i>	<i>Leadership</i>	<i>IT</i>	<i>Medical</i>	<i>Freshman</i>
Bryan Station	Mean	3.58	3.33	2.82	3.29	3
	Median	4	3.5	3	3	3
	SD	0.59	0.75	0.83	0.75	1.07
Frederick Douglass	Mean	--	3.31	3.35	3.56	3.67
	Median	--	3	3	4	4
	SD	--	0.68	0.68	0.60	0.47
Tates Creek	Mean	2.64	3.56	--	3.0	3.36
	Median	3	4	--	3	3.5
	SD	0.98	0.50	--	1.00	0.72

Notes. Frederick Douglass does not have an academy in the EMR category and Tates Creek does not have an academy in IT category.

When asked if the Academy model provides adequate time for collaborative planning, most teachers reported that their Academy model provided the time they needed (Table 6). Notably, Tates Creek EMR Academy had a mean response of 1.91, a median of 2, and a standard deviation of 1.0, indicating that most teachers in that academy did not feel their model provided adequate planning time. Tates Creek Leadership Academy also had a low mean of 2.44, but a median of 3 and a standard

deviation of 1.34 indicating more variance in their responses but a lower mean than other academies. Finally, Tates Creek Medical academy had a mean of 2.5 and a median of 2.5 with a standard deviation of 1.12, again indicating a high level of variance among staff answers. It is notable that the three lowest measures of center were consolidated within the same high school.

Other academies showed significantly higher means, with a high mean of 3.43 for the BSHS Freshman Academy, a median of 4, and a standard deviation of 0.73. These suggest more agreement (and less variance) between the teachers in this academy regarding collaboration. All other academies have means ranging from 2.75 to 3.38 and means of 3 to 4, indicating majority agreement that their academy structure provides time for collaboration. The range of teacher responses suggests that the individual school and/or academy that teachers belonged to influence the results. This indicates that a specific school and/or academy could have dedicated more time to collaboration when compared to others, while another may not have viewed collaboration as a priority.

When teachers were asked if their academy collaborated effectively, Bryan Station teachers responded with a mean of 3.53, a median of 4, and a standard deviation of 0.48. In comparison, Fredrick Douglass teachers responded with a mean of 3.35, a median of 3, and a standard deviation of 0.70, and Tates Creek teachers responded with a mean of 3.16, a median of 3, and a standard deviation of 0.87. This indicates that Bryan Station teachers, on average, consider their SLC more productive than the teachers at Fredrick Douglass and Tates Creek as both the mean and median indicate more agreement.

Table 6. School and Academy Descriptive Analysis Results, Question 25

<i>School</i>		<i>EMR</i>	<i>Leadership</i>	<i>IT</i>	<i>Medical</i>	<i>Freshman</i>
Bryan Station	Mean	3.05	2.75	3.09	2.94	3.43
	Median	3	3	3	3	4
	SD	0.94	0.60	0.51	0.94	0.73
Frederick Douglass	Mean	--	3.38	2.88	2.94	3.17
	Median	--	3.5	3	4	3.5
	SD	--	0.70	1.08	0.85	0.90
Tates Creek	Mean	1.91	2.44	--	2.50	3.29
	Median	2	3	--	2.5	3.5
	SD	1.0	1.34	--	1.12	0.89

Notes. Frederick Douglass does not have an academy in the EMR category and Tates Creek does not have an academy in IT category.

The standard deviation of the responses of Bryan Station teachers is also smaller than their counterparts at FDHS and TCHS (0.48 vs. 0.7 and 0.87, respectively), indicating less variance between teachers' responses. When asked if the Academy Model provided adequate collaborative planning time, BSHS teachers responded with a mean of 3.02, a median of 3, and a standard deviation of 0.94. FDHS teachers responded with a mean of 3.1, a median of 3, and a standard deviation of 0.89. TCHS teachers responded with a mean of 2.57, a median of 3, and a standard deviation of 1.18. Notably, TCHS teachers had a mean lower than BSHS and FDHS and a large standard deviation of 1.18, indicating less agreement and higher variance in responses from teachers from this school (Table 7).

Table 7. School Descriptive Analysis of Question 7 and Question 25

<i>School</i>		<i>Question 7</i>	<i>Question 25</i>
Bryan Station	Mean	3.53	3.02
	Median	4	3
	SD	0.48	0.83
Frederick Douglass	Mean	3.35	3.10
	Median	3	3
	SD	0.7	0.89
Tates Creek	Mean	3.16	2.57
	Median	3	3
	SD	0.87	1.18

Evidence from TELL Kentucky Survey

The TELL Kentucky Survey was administered to the teachers at Bryan Station High School in the spring of 2017, one year after the implementation of the academy structure. Bryan Station had a 65% response rate for this test administration while all of Fayette County Schools and all Kentucky high schools had response rates of 91% and 86%, respectively. For the purpose of my research, I focused on questions and sub-questions which I determined to relate specifically to teacher collaboration (Table 8). Those questions were Q2.1b, Q2.2b, Q6.1e, Q8.1k, Q9.1d, and Q9.1E. I also examined questions related to teacher retention and overall school culture; those were Q10.1 and

Q10.6. A complete copy of the 2017 TELL Kentucky Survey questions can be found in Appendix F.

Table 8. 2017 TELL Kentucky Survey Responses

<i>Question</i>	<i>Strongly disagree</i>	<i>Disagree</i>	<i>Agree</i>	<i>Strongly Agree</i>
Q2.1b	6	16	53	25
Q6.1e	4	36	47	12
Q8.1k	3	22	62	14
Q9.1d	1	4	55	40
Q9.1e	3	14	66	18

<i>Question</i>	<i>None</i>	<i>Less than or equal to 1 hour</i>	<i>More than 1 hour but less than or equal to 3 hours</i>	<i>More than 3 hours but less than or equal to 5 hours</i>	<i>More than 5 hours but less than or equal to 10 hours</i>	<i>More than 10 hours</i>
Q2.2b	8	43	35	10	5	0

Notes. Data are in percent of respondents who indicated each category; percentages are rounded to the nearest percent.

Notably, in response to question 2.1b “Teachers have time available to collaborate with colleagues”, 78% of teachers now responded Strongly Agree or Agree with that statement (Table 7; increasing from 36% in 2015). This is a remarkable increase of 42 percentage points. Similarly, in response to question 2.2b “Collaborative planning time” 50% of teachers now indicate they spend over one hour per week on collaborative planning (increasing from 22% in 2015). Finally, 59% of teachers responded Strongly Agree or Agree to question 6.1e, “The faculty has an effective process for making group decisions to solve problems” (increasing from 45% in 2015). Thus, after the transition to an Academy school, teachers report more time for collaboration.

Responses to additional questions on collaboration revealed that teachers find increased value in their collaboration after the transition to an Academy school. In response to question 8.1k, “Professional learning provides ongoing opportunities for teachers to work with colleagues to refine teaching practices”, 76% of teachers responded Strongly agree or Agree (an increase from 65% in 2015). In response to question 9.1d (Teachers work in professional learning communities to develop and align instructional practices) and 9.1e (Provided supports ... translate to improvements in instructional practices by teachers), teachers responded Strongly Agree or Agree at rates of 95% and 84%, respectively (an increase from 83% and 82% respectively in 2015).

Teachers reported an increased level of satisfaction with BSHS as a place of work after the transition to Academy school. 75% of teachers responded they planned to continue teaching at their current school (question 10.1; 65% in 2015) and 91% Strongly agreed or Agreed that BSHS was a good place to work and learn (question 10.6; 53% in 2015).

An examination of the change in the percentage of respondents for each of the questions of interest shows a clear shift in teacher responses (Table 9). For each of the questions mentioned, an increase in the percentage of Strongly agree or Agree responses was seen along with a decrease in Strongly Disagree and Disagree. Teachers also show an increase in responses indicating more than one hour spent collaborating, and a decrease in less than one hour or no time spent collaborating (Question 2.2b).

Table 9. 2015 to 2017 Percentage Change of TELL Kentucky Survey Responses

<i>Question</i>	<i>Strongly disagree</i>	<i>Disagree</i>	<i>Agree</i>	<i>Strongly Agree</i>
Q2.1b	-18	-24	24	19
Q6.1e	-13	-3	8	6
Q8.1k	-2	-8	5	6
Q9.1d	-8	-5	-6	18
Q9.1e	-3	-8	4	8

<i>Question</i>	<i>None</i>	<i>Less than or equal to 1 hour</i>	<i>More than 1 hour but less than or equal to 3 hours</i>	<i>More than 3 hours but less than or equal to 5 hours</i>	<i>More than 5 hours but less than or equal to 10 hours</i>	<i>More than 10 hours</i>
Q2.2b	-13	-14	17	6	5	0

Notes. Data are in percentage of respondents who indicated each category; percentages are rounded to the nearest percent.

Evidence from Group Level Assessment

Ten teachers from The Academies of Bryan Station participated in a digital GLA. During this process, they were asked to consider and respond to the following prompt:

Based on your experiences, describe teacher collaboration in the academy setting.

Please consider positives, negatives, structures, what worked, what was lacking, what supported or discouraged teacher collaboration, etcetera.

A complete copy of the information gathered during the digital GLA is in Appendix H. I now discuss GLA results from Prompt 2 that specifically mention or elude to collaboration. First, I discuss responses that were the most common among participants. Then I discuss unique responses specific to collaboration after the adoption of the academy model that the participants shared.

Collaboration. In response to the above prompts, the majority (8 of 10) of participant responses indicated that collaboration in the academy structure is “easier”, more “structured”, or existing at a higher level. However, participants were divided when describing this structure as an advantage or disadvantage in terms of their collaboration being authentic and useful. Two participants specifically stated that collaboration within their SLC meetings was completed in order to complete assigned tasks rather than engaging in authentic collaboration. Six of the ten participants stated that the effectiveness of collegial collaboration depends on the teachers rather than the structures in place.

Table 10. Prompt 2 Responses Specific to Collaboration After the Adoption of the Academy Model

GLA Participant	Prompt 2 Responses Specific to Collaboration after the Adoption of the Academy Model
A	<p>Collaboration is much more interdisciplinary.</p> <p>Overall, there is more collaboration as a school.</p>
B	Collaboration with fellow PLCs, we share ideas and lessons such as before.
C	More structured, admin mandated for discussion in SLCs; collaboration feels less authentic and more driven by a need to check a box.
D	<p>Global classes are a challenge when trying to collaborate between content areas, but academy specific classes lead to exciting opportunities for cross-curricular collaboration if other teachers are willing.</p> <p>Many more teachers are willing to try cross-curricular planning in the academy model.</p>
E	<p>It’s easier to collaborate our support services now for behavior and mental health but it can sometimes be harder to collaborate for academics.</p> <p>Sometimes the SLC structure turns into checking off tasks instead of fruitful conversation and collaboration but I still think the academy and SLC structure creates more of a small</p>

	learning feeling and community feeling for students and teachers.
F	Being able to talk about content with one group and students with another is huge, we all know that a lot of what happens in our classrooms has nothing to do with the content we are actually teaching. I can talk about what is going on in their other classes and make more authentic connections now.
G	Pre-AM it was harder to talk to other teachers about the same students, has helped academic success b/c I learned how to help my students more
H	PLCs and SLCs create the structure for effective collaboration, but the effectiveness of that collaboration still depends on the teachers and admin in those groups.
I	I have been in two different academies so I have different experiences as far as collaboration in our SLCs, it depends a lot on the size of the academy -- if it's too big it's hard to have student-centered conversations because there are too many of them.
J	<p>In the academy structure, collaboration is more focused within our SLCs. This focus comes at the cost of having time to meet and plan with colleagues in PLCs.</p> <p>I would call the SLCs a high-cost, low-yield environment in terms of the amount of time/energy spent in SLCs compared to positive outcomes for students. It seems like we'll get out of our SLCs what we put into them and a lot of teachers don't put much into them.</p> <p>Collaboration is more important for our PLCs so that we can create effective instruction, yet we're not provided the time or priority to do this work with all of the other required training and meetings.</p>

Communication. Participant E stated that communication within the academy structure has the potential to be “fruitful”, but often the meeting mandates within the academy structure make it difficult to have adequate time for effective communication to take place. Participant F indicated the advantages of being able to discuss content with one group (PLC) while focusing on students with another group (SLC) is advantageous and leads to connections that are more authentic with both content and students. Participant I felt the effectiveness of communication within the academy model varied

with the size of the academy. They felt if either the group of teachers or the group of subject students was too large it became difficult to have effective and focused student-centered conversations.

Time. Participant A indicated that effective collegial collaboration has weakened in the academy structure due to the limited amount of time available to teachers and the lack of common planning time. Participant C stated they personally have less time to work with individual teachers. Participant C attributed this to the meeting structures in place in the academy model. Of all participants, Participant J focused the most on the amount of time devoted to the academy structures and how that affects collaboration. Participant J shared the feeling that SLC's are a "high-cost, low-yield" practice in terms of the time and energy spend in relation to positive outcomes for students. Participant J also felt collaboration is more important for the PLC groups, yet these groups are not provided with sufficient time or priority to complete the needed work.

Emergent Themes

The third prompt utilized in the GLA process related to collegial collaboration in any school structure and what teachers believe is needed for effective collaboration to take place.

Based on your experiences, what is needed for effective teacher collaboration in any school structure? Please give supporting details/reasons when possible.

All ten participants cited time as a necessary resource, while four participants identified accountability. Three participants identified administrative support, communication, and feedback as needs. Participants also identified various other items, such as flexibility.

The final step in the GLA process involved participants identifying themes, both teacher and researcher identified, which emerged during the process and then ranking those themes based on which they felt were the most important. This information was gathered utilizing a Google Form, found in Appendix I. The list of themes the participants identified as well as total scores ascribed to each item based on rankings can be found in Table 11.

Table 11. Teacher Identified GLA Theme Ranking and Points

<i>Values</i>	<i>Points</i>
Protected Time	41
Teacher Input Valued and Utilized	23
Clear Purpose	20
Clear Expectations for All	17
Consistent Accountability	15
Authentic Collaboration	13
Consistency	11
Administrative Support	7
Flexibility	2
Other	1
Transparency	0

GLA results were analyzed utilizing descriptive and In Vivo coding. During this process, I examined responses, sentences, phrases, and quotes, identifying themes in order to ascribe meaning to the responses. I utilized the following three prompts during the GLA process:

1. Based on your experiences, describe teacher collaboration in the non-academy setting. Please consider positives, negatives, structures, what worked, what was lacking, what supported or discouraged teacher collaboration, etcetera.
2. Based on your experiences, describe teacher collaboration in the academy setting. Please consider positives, negatives, structures, what worked, what was lacking, what supported or discouraged teacher collaboration, etcetera.
3. Based on your experiences, what is needed for effective teacher collaboration in any school structure? Please give supporting details/reasons when possible.

The GLA process provided insight into each teacher's perspectives on collaboration in both the non-academy and academy structures. The process revealed additional themes related to collegial collaboration including communication and time. Subcategories within those themes also emerged. I present these data in chart form in order to provide a clear picture of participant responses (See Table 12).

Table 12. Teacher Perceptions of Collegial Collaboration in Non-Academy and Academy Structures

<i>Theme</i>	<i>Sub-Category</i>	<i>Participants</i>									
		<i>A</i>	<i>B</i>	<i>C</i>	<i>D</i>	<i>E</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>G</i>	<i>H</i>	<i>I</i>	<i>J</i>
Collaboration	Effectiveness	X	X	X	X	X	X		X		X
	Clear Expectations	X							X		
	Admin Support	X		X	X		X	X			
Communication	Consistency									X	
	Clarity		X			X				X	X
	Student-Centered					X	X	X		X	X
Time	Quantity	X	X	X	X	X		X			X
	Protected						X	X	X	X	X

Notes. X indicates a sub-category discussed by the participant.

Chapter Summary

My analysis suggests that the staff, students, and community of Bryan Station High School received the academy structure positively. The people who were the catalyst for the change worked closely with Ford NGL, FCPS, and local business partners to make it a reality. After the implementation at Bryan Station, two additional high schools in the district made the change to and/or implemented the academy structure.

The purpose of my research study was to determine if teachers perceived a greater level of effective collegial collaboration in the academy structure than in a traditional high school structure. While analysis of targeted data, dealing specifically with teacher collaboration, demonstrated a clear and positive change in perception, I cannot entirely attribute the change to the academy structure. In Chapter V, I will discuss this and other personal reflections as a researcher in addition to implications for further research.

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSIONS

In an effort to influence student culture and achievement positively, Bryan Station High School began transitioning to an academy structure in the fall of 2016. While Bryan Station was the first school within Fayette County Public Schools to implement this structure, two other high schools followed suit in the next two years. One of the hallmarks of the academy structure is small learning communities for both students and teachers, which are in place in two forms at Bryan Station. Teachers take part in academy based SLCs as well as content-based PLCs; these structures seek to provide teachers time and a venue to collaborate within their content and their academy. Hoagland et al. (2014) found when teacher groups engage in an ongoing process to support students academically and behaviorally, it results in student achievement gains.

Discussion

My research intended to determine if teachers perceived collegial collaboration differently in a non-academy structure versus an academy structure. The purpose of this was to establish if a school's structure had an impact on the level of effective collegial collaboration. While it was impossible to attribute my findings on collaboration solely on the academy structure due to the existence of other organizational factors such as a leadership change at the school level, I made efforts through data collection and analysis to have research participants solely address their perceptions of collegial collaboration.

Academy Model. The academy model adopted at Bryan Station High School was one promoted and supported by the Ford Next Generation Learning group. The Ford NGL model focused on three strands of transformation: the transformation of teaching and learning, the transformation of the secondary school experience, and the transformation of business and civic engagement.

While the group promoted these concepts and provided support and guidance for the transition, Ford NGL left many details of the structure up to individual schools to decide. Caskey and Carpenter (2014) stated that in order for a school model to support productive teacher collaboration there must be dedicated common planning time and/or professional learning communities within the school day. Bryan Station did so by providing common planning time at the academy level (SLC) and at the content level (PLC).

Collaboration. During the research process, it became evident that participants and respondents did not employ a common definition of collegial collaboration. Some seemed to view it as a group of co-workers being civil in a meeting while others viewed it as co-workers coordinating efforts and activities to increase student learning. Some participants categorized collaboration as authentic while others described it merely as a task to be completed. This raises questions about the nature of collaboration and if those in education understand the concept, much less how to foster and support collegial collaboration. Prior research reveals that it is difficult to define collegial collaboration concretely (Vangrieken et al., 2015). These scholars found terms such as collegiality, professional learning communities, teacher teaming, teacher collaboration, and professional networks applied in education.

Data Sources. I drew upon three data sources during the course of my research — the Academies of Lexington Teacher Survey, the Kentucky TELL Survey, and a Group Level Assessment. The Kentucky TELL Survey results and the Academies of Lexington Teacher Survey results included data points that gauged respondent perceptions of teacher collaboration. I was able to select relevant questions and results from each and eliminate questions and results that did not address collaboration.

The Kentucky TELL Survey included data on a wide range of topics and I found the data to have a consistent trend between the 2015 and 2017 results. The percentage of respondents to answer questions positively (agree or strongly agree) increased on 82 of the 90 statements presented (Appendix J). Perhaps the most telling result was an increase in positive responses of 37.3% to the statement “Overall, my school is a good place to work and learn” (TELL Kentucky, 2017). However, I cannot reasonably attribute that increase solely to the academy structure. While the Academies of Lexington Teacher Survey did not have multiple years of data for comparison and was administered only after the implementation of the academy structure, it did provide me with data specific to teacher perception of collaboration in the academy structure.

The third data source, a digital GLA, produced a great deal of data. However, it was difficult at times for the participants to separate their perceptions of collaboration within the two structures from other contributing factors. The participants most often spoke about collaboration in terms of barriers or supports rather than isolating collaboration as a variable. The process provided information about other factors the participants feel are vital to effective collaboration.

Emergent Themes. My research study produced insight into areas other than collegial collaboration that participants believed are necessary for effective collaboration to take place. Many of these themes were logistical or based at the school/administrative leadership level. Notably, time was a recurring theme that participants expressed there was not enough of and/or not enough of their time was “protected”. Despite non-instructional time built into their schedule, this time often served as a time for other meetings or obligations that did not support the collaborative process.

When examining results from the 2015 and 2017 administrations of the TELL Kentucky survey, it is evident that respondents felt they had more time for collaboration after the adoption of the academy model. Seven questions made up the survey category of time; these seven questions had an average increase of 29.65% in the categories of Strongly Agree and Agree from 2015 to 2017 (TELL Kentucky, 2017). When asked about “...available time to collaborate with colleagues” and “...non-instructional time provided for teachers in my school [being] sufficient”, the percentage who agreed (Strongly Agree or Agree) increased by 42.6% and 36.7%, respectively.

Other themes that emerged had accountability and clarity of communication as their foci. Accountability received the most emphasis and mentions; specifically, a lack of consistent accountability among both teachers and administration. Participants stated that in some professional groups the structure of the school did not change the dynamic in those groups. They expressed the division of work was not equal and most often the same teachers and/or administrators would take on the majority of the work responsibility. Participants also revealed that there was no system in place to ensure shared accountability. Clarity of communication was another theme that emerged.

Participants revealed a lack of communication or ineffectiveness of communication. However, this was not due to the academy model structure, but rather due to the leadership of the academy or school.

Implications for Policy and Practice

My research underscores the need for a deeper understanding of the structures and processes that may be in place within any school structure that may foster effective collegial collaboration. A need also exists for exploration of what comprises effective teacher collaboration and what are the measures available or developed to that end.

Some data in this study supported the idea that the structures are in place within the academy model to provide time for collaboration but did not ensure that collaboration was effective for teachers or students. Through my analysis, it became evident that clear expectations for the outcomes of collaboration are necessary to prevent the intended action from becoming simply a task to be completed and checked off rather than an ongoing process embedded deeply in the work. Additionally, for collaboration to occur, time for teachers to work together needs to be valued and protected by the administrative staff. This is evident from both the teacher feedback in the GLA as well as the results from the Academies of Lexington survey.

In these data, Fredrick Douglass and Bryan Station high schools both have a relatively high agreement with the statements “My SLC collaborates effectively” and “The Academy Model provides adequate time for collaboration”. However, the third academy-model high school, Tates Creek, has much lower means and higher standard deviations, indicating that some structures within that school do not promote collaboration or produce a high variance in responses despite using the academy model.

Thus, the academy model can produce time for collaboration if it is protected and valued by administrators and staff within the school.

Implications for Future Research

Previous research listed the defining characteristics of successful collaboration as 1) being voluntary, 2) requiring parity among participants, 3) being based on mutual goals, 4) depending on shared responsibility for participation and decision making, 5) sharing of resources, and 6) having shared accountability for outcomes (Friend & Cook, 1992). Perhaps among these six characteristics lies the essential elements for collegial collaboration to be effective. Examining collaboration as a whole through the lens of the academy structure does not appear to have produced the data necessary to make a determination on the effect of the academy structure on teacher perception of collegial collaboration.

Further research may examine issues with collaboration that arise within the academy model. Because it has been shown that the academy model can allow for time for effective collaboration, a logical next step would be to determine what choices by school administration would detract from or better support that time. This information can further the structures and supports built-in the academy model to ensure effective collaborative experiences for all teachers.

An additional research opportunity would be to compare academy model high schools with traditional model high schools of similar size, structure, and leadership to produce more convincing evidence on the effectiveness of the academy model at producing collaborative opportunities for teachers. This comparative structure would attempt to find schools that match in all characteristics except the academy model design

and compare teacher perceptions of collaborative time. Controlling for additional variables in this manner will produce further evidence on the effective use of the academy model to produce collaborative opportunities for teachers.

Also, full TELL Survey results highlight other areas, such as increased trust and mutual respect (Q7.1b: increase from 43% to 67% Strongly Agree or Agree), increased administrative support of teachers (Q7.1d: increase from 42% to 65% Strongly Agree or Agree) and an increase in perceived school safety (Q5.1g: increase from 50% to 92% Strongly Agree or Agree). Any of these areas may be a potential topic for future research into the effects of the implementation of the academy model.

Conclusion

I sought to provide insights into how the academy structure supports teacher perception of collegial collaboration. My research questions included:

- How do teachers describe their experiences with collegial collaboration in a traditional school setting prior to adopting the academy model?
- How do teachers describe their experiences with collegial collaboration in an academy setting after adopting the academy model?

I drew upon social constructivism to frame my study. While the theory has its basis in the work of Jean Piaget, the theory I utilized is more closely related to the work of Vygotsky. Vygotsky's constructivism theory places an emphasis on the individual's social interaction in the development of cognition (Kim, 2001). Vygotsky described a process at the root of which lies the essential concept that individuals, in this case, teachers at Bryan Station High School, construct meaning through their understanding of

an experience or phenomena as interpreted through their prior experiences and their understanding of the world around them (Creswell, 2014).

My findings are significant because they establish implications for schools that need to implement structures that will allow them to increase the effectiveness of teacher collaboration. This may be in an effort to increase student achievement, achieve higher rates of teacher retention, or improve student behavior (Moore, 2009). While my research participants expressed the need for protected time, clear expectations, and other supports to be in place, their description of their experiences and the data sources all convey that they experience higher levels of professional collaboration in the academy structure. This establishes a basis for exploring the implementation of the academy structure for the purpose of increasing the level of effective collegial collaboration.

REFERENCES

- Aldridge, D. P. (2003). The dilemma, challenges and the duality of an African-American educational historian. *Educational Researcher*, 32(9), 25-34.
- All Things, PLC. (2013). *About PLCs*. Retrieved from <https://www.allthingsplc.info/about>
- Applied Educational Systems. (2020). *What is career & technical education?* Retrieved from <https://www.aeseducation.com/blog/career-technical-education-cte>
- Bandura, A. (1997). Theoretical perspectives. *Self-efficacy: The exercise of control*, 1-35.
- Bernstein, L., Millsap, M. A., Schimmenti, J., & Page, L. (2008). Implementation study of smaller learning communities. Final Report. *US Department of Education*.
- Bodilly, S. J., Glennan, T. K., Kerr, K. A., & Galegher, J. R. (2004). Introduction: Framing the problem. In R. K. Glennan, J. R. Galegher, & K. A. Kerr (Eds.), *Expanding the reach of education reforms: Perspectives from leaders in the scale-up of educational interventions* (pp. 1-34). Santa Monica, CA: RAND.
- Borek, J. (2008). A nation at risk at 25. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 89(8), 572-574.
- Brennan, P. (2001, September). School: The story of American public education. *The Washington Post*. Retrieved from <https://www.washingtonpost.com/>
- Brownell, M. T., Yeager, E., Rennells, M. S., & Riley, T. (1997). Teachers working together: What teacher educators and researchers should know. *Teacher education and special education*, 20(4), 340-359.
- Caskey, M. M., & Carpenter, J. (2014). Building teacher collaboration school-wide. *AMLE Magazine*, 2(3), 34-36.
- Castellano, M., Sundell, K. E., & Richardson, G. B. (2017). Achievement outcomes among high school graduates in college and career readiness programs of study. *Peabody Journal of Education*, 92(2), 254-274.
- Chapman, T. K. (2007). Interrogating classroom relationships and events: Using portraiture and critical race theory in education research. *Educational Researcher*, 36(3), 156-162.
- Chubb, J. E. (1988). Why the current wave of school reform will fail. *The Public Interest*, 90, 28.

- Chng, L. S., & Lund, J. (2018). Assessment for learning in physical education: The what, why and how. *Journal of Physical Education, Recreation & Dance*, 89(8), 29-34.
- Creswell, J. W. (2014). Preliminary considerations. In V. Knight, K. Koscielak, B. Bauhaus, & M. Markanich (Eds.), *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches*. (pp.1-77). Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- Creswell, J. W., & Poth, C. N. (2017). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches*. Los Angeles: SAGE.
- Crowe, S., Cresswell, K., Robertson, A., Huby, G., Avery, A., & Sheikh, A. (2011). The case study approach. *BMC Medical Research Methodology*, 11, 100.
<https://doi.org/10.1186/1471-2288-11-100>
- Curran, F. C., Viano, S. L., & Fisher, B. W. (2019). Teacher victimization, turnover, and contextual factors promoting resilience. *Journal of School Violence*, 18(1), 21-38.
Retrieved from <https://www.tandfonline.com/loi/wjsv20>
- Darling-Hammond, L. (1996). The quiet revolution: Rethinking teacher development. *Educational Leadership*, 53(6), 4-10.
- Darling-Hammond, L., & Richardson, N. (2009). Research review/teacher learning: What matters. *Educational leadership*, 66(5), 46-53.
- Dayton, C. (2010). Planning Guide for Career Academies. *Career Academy Support Network*.
- Denzin, J. K. & Lincoln, Y. S. (2011). Introduction: The discipline and practice of qualitative research. *The SAGE handbook of qualitative research* (4th ed., pp. 1-19). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- DiNuzzo, E. (2017, August). What school was like the year you were born. *Business Insider*. Retrieved from <http://www.businessinsider.com>
- Dixon, M., Cotner, B., Wilson, T. N., & Borman, K. (2011). Implementing career academies in Florida: A case study approach to understanding successes and obstacles. *Career and Technical Education Research*, 36(3), 207-227.
- DuFour, R., & Eaker, R. (1998). Professional learning communities. *Bloomington, IN: National Educational Service*. Education Policy: A Timeline. (2018). *ASCD and Education Policy: 75 Years of Leadership*, 24(1), 4-4. Retrieved from <http://www.ascd.org/publications/newsletters/policy-priorities/vol24/num01/Education-Policy@-A-Timeline.aspx>
- Field, A. (2013). Everything you never wanted to know about statistics. In M.

- Carmichael, R. Lupton, & I. Antcliff (Eds.), *Discovering statistics using IBM .SPSS Statistics* (pp. 40-88). London: Sage.
- Fischetti, J., & Smith, R. (2010). Introduction to the special issue on transforming the American high school: The premise and promise of small learning communities. *Peabody Journal of Education*, 85(3), 259-263.
- Fletcher, E. (2006). No curriculum left behind: The effects of the No Child Left Behind legislation on career and technical education. *Career and Technical Education Research*, 31(3), 157-174.
- Ford Next Generation Learning. (2019). 2018 Network Profile. Retrieved from <https://www.fordngl.com/reports>
- Ford Next Generation Learning. (2017). Elevate 2017 Annual Report. Retrieved from <https://www.fordngl.com/reports>
- Friend, M., & Cook, L. (1992). *Interactions: Collaboration skills for school professionals*. White Plains, NY: Longman.
- Gates, B. (2005). Bill Gates – National education summit on high schools. Retrieved from <https://www.gatesfoundation.org>
- Gibbs, G. R. (2018). *Analyzing qualitative data* (Vol. 6). Los Angeles: Sage.
- Goddard, Y. L., Goddard, R. D., & Tschannen-Moran, M. (2007). A theoretical and empirical investigation of teacher collaboration for school improvement and student achievement in public elementary schools. *Teachers college record*, 109(4), 877-896.
- Gordon, H. R. D. (2014). *The history and growth of career and technical education in America*. Long Grove, IL: Waveland Press.
- Gray, K. (2004). Is high school career and technical education obsolete? *Phi Delta Kappan*, 86(2), 128–134.
- Hanford, E. (2014). The troubled history of vocational education. *American Radio Works*.
- Hattie, J. (2015). The applicability of Visible Learning to higher education. *Scholarship of Teaching and Learning in Psychology*, 1(1), 79.
- Hawkins, V. J. (2009). Barriers to implementing differentiation: Lack of confidence, efficacy and perseverance. *The NERA Journal*, 44(2), 11-16.
- Hoagland, A. E., Birkenfield, K., & Box, J. A. (2014). Professional learning communities: Creating a foundation for collaboration skills in pre-service teachers. *Education* 134(4), 521-528.

- Hodge, E., & Dougherty, S. (2020). *Tracking and the future of career and technical education: how efforts to connect school and work can avoid the past mistakes of vocational education*. Boulder, CO: National Education Policy Center. Retrieved from <http://nepc.colorado.edu/publication/cte>.
- Hord, S. M. (2004). *Learning together, leading together: Changing schools through professional learning communities*. New York: Teachers College Press and National Staff Development Council.
- Hughes, G. D. (2012). Teacher retention: Teacher characteristics, school characteristics, organizational characteristics, and teacher efficacy. *The Journal of Educational Research*, 105(4), 245-255. Retrieved from <https://www.tandfonline.com/loi/vjer20>
- Hurst, D., Tan, A., Meek, A., & Sellers, J. (2003). Overview and inventory of state education reforms: 1990 to 2000. *Washington, DC: National Center for Education Statistics*.
- Kantor, H. (1991). Education, social reform, and the state: ESEA and federal education policy in the 1960s. *American Journal of Education*, 100(1), 47-83.
- Kardos, S. M., & Johnson, S. M. (2007). On their own and presumed expert: New teachers' experience with their colleagues. *Teachers College Record*, 109(9), 2083-2106.
- Ketterlin-Geller, L. R., Baumer, P., & Lichon, K. (2015). Administrators as advocates for teacher collaboration. *Intervention in School and Clinic*, 51(1), 51-57.
- Kemple, J. J. (1997). Career Academies. Communities of support for students and seachers: Emerging findings from a 10-site evaluation (Rep.). New York, NY: Manpower Demonstration Research. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED415403)
- Kemple, J. J., & Snipes, J. C. (2000, March). Career academies impacts on students' engagement and performance in high school.
- Kemple, J., & Willner, C. (2008). *Career academies: Long-term impacts on labor market outcomes, educational attainment, and transitions to adulthood* (pp. 4-5). New York: MDRC
- Kentucky Department of Education. (2019). School Report Card. Retrieved from <https://www.kyschoolreportcard.com/organization/53947?year=2019>
- Kim, B. (2001). Social Constructivism. In M. Orey (Ed.), *Emerging perspectives on learning, teaching, and technology*. North Charleston: CreateSpace.

- Labonte, M., & Levit, M. (2006, October). *Financing issues and economic effects of American wars*. Congressional Research Service, the Library of Congress.
- Ladson-Billings, G. (2000). Racialized discourses and ethnic epistemologies. In N. Denzin & Y. Lincoln, (Eds.), *The SAGE handbook of qualitative research* (2nd ed., pp. 257-277). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Lincoln, Y., & Guba, E. (1985). Thousand Oaks. *Naturalistic Inquiry*, 290-296.
- Little, J. W., & McLaughlin, M. W. (Eds.). (1993). *Teachers' work: Individuals, colleagues, and contexts*. Teachers College Press.
- Kruse, S.D., Louis, K.S., & Bryk, A.S. (1995). An emerging framework for analyzing school professional community. In K.S. Louis, S.D. Kruse, & Associates (Eds.), *Professionalism and community: Perspectives on reforming schools* (pp. 23-44). Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin.
- Malkus, N. (2019). The Evolution of Career and Technical Education. *AEI Paper & Studies*, 1L.
- Milner IV, H. R. (2007). Race, culture, and researcher positionality: Working through dangers seen, unseen, and unforeseen. *Educational researcher*, 36(7), 388–400.
- Moore, T. O. (2009). *Teacher perceptions of the benefits of teacher collaboration and an analysis of indicators of potential teacher attrition* (Doctoral Dissertation). Retrieved from <https://scholarsarchive.byu.edu/etd/1811/>
- Morris, I. J. (2011). Impact of a professional learning community on teacher collaboration, teaching practice, and student achievement (Doctoral dissertation). *ProQuest LLC*.
- Muschkin, C. G., & Bonneau, K. L. (2012, June). *Easing the transition to high school: Effects of a freshman academy on student success*. Paper presented at the meeting of The National Center on Scaling up Effective Schools, Nashville, TN.
- National Career Academy Coalition. (2019). NACA past, present and future. Retrieved from <https://www.ncacinc.com/about/history>
- National Commission on Excellence in Education. (1983). *A Nation at risk: The imperative for educational reform: An open letter to the American people*. Washington, DC: United States Government Printing Office.
- New Teacher Center. (2013a, Spring). *2013 TELL Kentucky survey: Preliminary findings of the 2013 TELL Kentucky survey*. (NTC Publication No. BRF-PRF-USKY-1304-EN). Retrieved from www.tellkentucky.org/uploads
- New Teacher Center. (2013b, Spring). *2013 TELL Kentucky survey: Validity and*

- reliability report*. (NTC Publication No. BRF-VLRL-USKY-1304-EN). Retrieved from www.tellkentucky.org/uploads/File/KY13_val_rel.pdf
- New Teacher Center. (2013c, Spring). *2013 TELL Kentucky: Kentucky Reports*. Retrieved from www.tellkentucky.org/reports
- New Teacher Center. (2017). *School leadership counts: Practice brief*. (NTC Publication No. BRF-SLM-US-1710-EN). Retrieved from www.newteachercenter.org/resources
- Noor, K. B. M. (2008). Case study: A strategic research methodology. *American journal of applied sciences*, 5(11), 1602-1604.
- Pounder, D. G. (1999). Teacher teams: Exploring job characteristics and work-related outcomes of work group enhancement. *Educational administration quarterly*, 35(3), 317-348.
- Powell, W. (2007). Professional learning communities: What are they and why are they important? *SEDL Archive*, 8(2).
- Prichard Committee Team on Teacher Effectiveness. (2013). *Strengthening the teaching profession in Kentucky*. Retrieved from <https://tellkentucky.org/research>
- Public Schools of North Carolina State Board of Education (2008). *Future-ready schools: Preparing students for the 21st century*. Retrieved from <https://stateboard.ncpublicschools.gov/resources/biennial-reports/2004-06biennial-report.pdf>
- Ray, A., & Margaret, W. (Eds.). (2003). *PISA Programme for international student assessment (PISA) PISA 2000 technical report: PISA 2000 technical report*. OECD Publishing.
- Reddy, W. B. (1996). *Group-level team assessment: A 10-step sequence to a committed team*. San Diego, CA: Pfeiffer.
- Ronfeldt, M., Farmer, S. O., McQueen, K., & Grissom, J. A. (2015). Teacher collaboration in instructional teams and student achievement. *American Education Research Journal*, 52(3), 475-514.
- Rosenholtz, S. J. (1989). *Teachers' workplace: The social organization of schools*. New York: Longman.
- Saldaña, J. (2016). *The coding manual for qualitative researchers*. Los Angeles, CA: Sage.
- Seashore-Louis, K., Dretzke, B., & Wahlstrom, K. (2010). How does leadership affect student achievement? Results from a national US survey. *School effectiveness and school improvement*, 21(3), 315-336.

- Shachar, H., & Shmuelewitz, H. (1997). Implementing cooperative learning, teacher collaboration and teachers' sense of efficacy in heterogeneous junior high schools. *Contemporary educational psychology*, 22(1), 53-72.
- Stipanovic, N., Stringfield, S., & Witherell, E. (2017). The influence of a career pathways model and career counseling on students' career and academic self-efficacy. *Peabody Journal of Education*, 92(2), 209-221.
- Swanlund, A. (2011). *Identifying working conditions that enhance teacher effectiveness: The psychometric evaluation of the Teacher Working Conditions Survey*. Chicago, IL: American Institutes for Research.
- Tschannen-Moran, M. (2001). Collaboration and the need for trust. *Journal of Educational administration*.
- TELL Survey FAQ. (n.d.). Retrieved January 18, 2020, from <https://tellkentucky.org/faq>
- Tillman, L.C. (2002). Culturally sensitive research approaches for African-American perspective. *Educational Research*, 31(9), 3-12.
- Vangrieken, K., Dochy, F., Raes, E., & Kyndt, E. (2015). Teacher collaboration: A systematic review. *Educational Research Review*, 15, 17-40.
- Vaughan, L. (2014). *Group level assessment: A large group method for identifying primary issues and needs within a community*. Sage Publications, Ltd.
- Vaughn, L. M., & Lohmueller, M. (2014). Calling all stakeholders: Group-level assessment (GLA) – A qualitative and participatory method for large groups. *Evaluation review*, 38(4), 336–355.
- Wang, V. C. X. (2009). Definitive reading in the history, philosophy, practice and theories of career and technical education. In E. Brewer (Ed.), *The history of career and technical education* (pp. 1-14). Hangzhou, China: Zhejiang University Press.
- Waters, P. (2019, April). Relationships, resources, resilience: Professional learning communities to improve teacher retention. Paper presented at the meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Toronto, Canada.
- Whyte, D., & Greene, S. (2006). The skilled workforce shortage. *National Center for Construction Education and Research*. White Paper. Available at: www.nccer.org/uploads/fileLibrary/research/SkilledWorkforceCrisis.pdf
- Yin, R. K. (2014). *Case study research: Design and method* (5th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Youngs, P., Holdgreve-Resendez, R. T., & Qian, H. (2011). The role of instructional program coherence in beginning elementary teachers' induction experiences. *The Elementary School Journal*, 111(3), 455-476.

Zaidah, Z. (2003). *An investigation into the effects of discipline-specific knowledge proficiency and genre on reading comprehension strategies of Malaysia ESP students*. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of Reading, Reading, United Kingdom.

APPENDIX A: ACADEMIES OF LEXINGTON REFLECTION SURVEY 2020

5/15/2020

Academies of Lexington Teacher Survey

Academies of Lexington Teacher Survey

The following survey, conducted by The Academies of Lexington, seeks anonymous feedback about your career academy experience. This survey is in two parts. Please indicate on a scale the degree to which you disagree or agree with the statement. Part II asks you to briefly respond to 5 prompts.

*** Required**

1. I am a TEACHER at (select one): *

Mark only one oval.

- ☐ Bryan Station - Freshman Academy
- ☐ Bryan Station - EMR Academy
- ☐ Bryan Station - IT Academy
- ☐ Bryan Station - Leadership Academy
- ☐ Bryan Station - Medical Academy
- ☐ Frederick Douglass - Freshman Academy - Orange Team
- ☐ Frederick Douglass - Freshman Academy - Green Team
- ☐ Frederick Douglass - Academy of Technology
- ☐ Frederick Douglass - Academy of Health Science
- ☐ Frederick Douglass - Academy of Professional Services
- ☐ Bates Creek - Freshman Academy
- ☐ Bates Creek - Design and Engineering Academy
- ☐ Bates Creek - Business, Entrepreneurship, and Education Academy
- ☐ Bates Creek - Medical and Emergency Services Academy
- ☐ Bates Creek - International Baccalaureate and Information Technology Academy

Part I

Please indicate the degree to which you disagree or agree with the statement.

Please respond to each of the items below using one of these four levels:

- 1 - Strongly disagree
- 2 - Disagree
- 3 - Agree
- 4 - Strongly Agree

https://docs.google.com/forms/d/1Zcc5_vSYUxrnA2eLyhj9NzAhdvvi-W4rDzyKLkQoYY2A/edit

1/12

2. My SLC has effective student centered discussions. *

Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	
Strongly disagree	☐	☐	☐	☐	Strongly agree

3. My SLC effectively analyzes and uses data. *

Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	
Strongly disagree	☐	☐	☐	☐	Strongly agree

4. My SLC effectively distributes leadership. *

Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	
Strongly disagree	☐	☐	☐	☐	Strongly agree

5. My SLC effectively promotes a positive staff culture. *

Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	
Strongly disagree	☐	☐	☐	☐	Strongly agree

6. My SLC effectively promotes a positive student culture. *

Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	
Strongly disagree	☐	☐	☐	☐	Strongly agree

7. My SLC effectively collaborates for student learning. *

Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	
Strongly disagree	☐	☐	☐	☐	Strongly agree

8. My SLC effectively promotes professional teacher growth. *

Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	
Strongly disagree	☐	☐	☐	☐	Strongly agree

9. My SLC effectively uses established processes for group decision making. *

Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	
Strongly disagree	☐	☐	☐	☐	Strongly agree

10. My SLC effectively uses established processes for group problem solving. *

Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	
Strongly disagree	☐	☐	☐	☐	Strongly agree

Communication

Please indicate the degree to which you disagree or agree with the statement.

Please respond to each of the items below using one of these four levels:

- 1 - Strongly disagree
- 2 - Disagree
- 3 - Agree
- 4 - Strongly Agree

11. My team/academy leads communicate relevant information in a timely and effective manner. *

Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	
Strongly disagree	☐	☐	☐	☐	Strongly agree

12. My academy counselor(s) communicates relevant information in a timely and effective manner. *

Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	
Strongly disagree	☐	☐	☐	☐	Strongly agree

13. My academy principal(s) communicates relevant information in a timely and effective manner. *

Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	
Strongly disagree	☐	☐	☐	☐	Strongly agree

14. My academy coach communicates relevant information in a timely and effective manner. *

Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	
Strongly disagree	☐	☐	☐	☐	Strongly agree

15. My executive principal communicates relevant information in a timely and effective manner. *

Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	
Strongly disagree	☐	☐	☐	☐	Strongly agree

Instructional Leadership

In this case instructional leadership includes conducting classroom walkthroughs and providing instructional support such as resources and feedback designed to improve teaching and learning.

Please indicate the degree to which you disagree or agree with the statement.

Please respond to each of the items below using one of these four levels:

1 - Strongly disagree

2 - Disagree

3 - Agree

4 - Strongly Agree

16. My team/academy leads are instructional leaders. *

Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	
Strongly disagree	☐	☐	☐	☐	Strongly agree

17. My academy principal(s) is an instructional leader. *

Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	
Strongly disagree	☐	☐	☐	☐	Strongly agree

18. My academy coach is an instructional leader. *

Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	
Strongly disagree	☐	☐	☐	☐	Strongly agree

19. My executive principal is an instructional leader. *

Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	
Strongly disagree	☐	☐	☐	☐	Strongly agree

Business
Partnerships

Please indicate the degree to which you disagree or agree with the statement.

Please respond to each of the items below using one of these four levels:

- 1 - Strongly disagree
- 2 - Disagree
- 3 - Agree
- 4 - Strongly Agree

20. My academy utilizes business partnerships to enhance student learning. *

Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	
Strongly disagree	☐	☐	☐	☐	Strongly agree

21. I utilize business partnerships to enhance student learning. *

Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	
Strongly disagree	☐	☐	☐	☐	Strongly agree

22. It is easy for me to request business partner engagement in my classroom. *

Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	
Strongly disagree	☐	☐	☐	☐	Strongly agree

23. When I request business partner engagement I am connected with an appropriate resource. *

Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	
Strongly disagree	☐	☐	☐	☐	Strongly agree

The Academy
Model

Please indicate the degree to which you disagree or agree with the statement.

Please respond to each of the items below using one of these four levels:

- 1 - Strongly disagree
- 2 - Disagree
- 3 - Agree
- 4 - Strongly Agree

24. The academy model provides adequate individual planning time. *

Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	
Strongly disagree	☐	☐	☐	☐	Strongly agree

25. The academy model provides adequate collaborative planning time. *

Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	
Strongly disagree	☐	☐	☐	☐	Strongly agree

26. The academy model deepens student learning. *

Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	
Strongly disagree	☐	☐	☐	☐	Strongly agree

27. The academy model provides students with a sense of self-efficacy. *

Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	
Strongly disagree	☐	☐	☐	☐	Strongly agree

28. The academy model provides teachers with a sense of self-efficacy. *

Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	
Strongly disagree	☐	☐	☐	☐	Strongly agree

29. The academy model improves student/student relationships. *

Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	
Strongly disagree	☐	☐	☐	☐	Strongly agree

30. The academy model improves student/teacher relationships. *

Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	
Strongly disagree	☐	☐	☐	☐	Strongly agree

31. The academy model improves teacher/teacher relationships. *

Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	
Strongly disagree	☐	☐	☐	☐	Strongly agree

32. The academy model provides practical connections to core academy content. *

Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	
Strongly disagree	☐	☐	☐	☐	Strongly agree

33. I need professional development in the following area(s)

Check all that apply.

- ☐ Project based learning
- ☐ Interdisciplinary curriculum development
- ☐ Externships
- ☐ Collaborative teaching structures
- ☐ Effective teaming
- ☐ Using data to improve instruction
- ☐ Technology
- ☐ Curriculum alignment
- ☐ Learner-centered classrooms

Other: ☐ _____

Part II

34. The aspects of the academy structure that help the most are: *

35. The aspects of the academy structure that help the least are: *

This content is neither created nor endorsed by Google.

5/15/2020

Academies of Lexington Teacher Survey
Google Forms

https://docs.google.com/forms/d/1Zcc5_vSYUxnA2eLyhj9NzAhdvvi-W4rDzyKLkQeYY2A/edit

12/12

APPENDIX B: 2017 TELL SURVEY QUESTIONS

INTRODUCTION

Please indicate your position:

- ☐ Teacher (including instructional coaches, department heads, vocational, literacy specialist, etc.)
- ☐ Principal
- ☐ Assistant Principal
- ☐ Other Education Professional (school counselor, school psychologist, social worker, etc.)

How many total years have you been employed as an educator?

- ☐ First Year
- ☐ 2 – 3 years
- ☐ 4 – 6 years
- ☐ 7 – 10 years
- ☐ 11 – 20 years
- ☐ 20+ years

How many total years have you been employed in the school in which you are currently teaching?

- ☐ First Year
- ☐ 2 – 3 years
- ☐ 4 – 6 years
- ☐ 7 – 10 years
- ☐ 11 – 20 years
- ☐ 20+ years

TIME

Please rate how strongly you agree or disagree with the following statements about the use of time in your school.

- a. Class sizes are reasonable such that teachers^[1] have the time available to meet the needs of all students
- b. Teachers have time available to collaborate with colleagues.
- c. Teachers are allowed to focus on educating students with minimal interruptions.
- d. The non-instructional time^[2] provided for teachers in my school is sufficient.
- e. Efforts are made to minimize the amount of routine paperwork^[3] teachers are required to do.
- f. Teachers have sufficient instructional time to meet the needs of all students.
- g. Teachers are protected from duties that interfere with their essential role of educating students.

Strongly disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly agree	Don't know
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

[1] Teachers means a majority of teachers in your school

[2] Non-instructional time includes any time during the day without the responsibility for student contact, including collaboration planning, meetings/conferences with students and families, etc.

[3] Routine paperwork means both electronic and paper forms and documentation that must be completed to comply with school, district, state, and federal policies.

In an AVERAGE week, how much time do you devote to the following activities during the school day (i.e., time for which you are under contract to be at the school)?

- a. Individual planning time
- b. Collaborative planning time^[1]
- c. Supervisory duties^[2]
- d. Required committee and/or staff meetings
- e. Completing required administrative paperwork^[3]
- f. Preparing for/participating in the teacher evaluation process^{[4]*}
- g. Communicating with parents/guardians and/or the community
- h. Addressing student discipline issues
- i. Professional learning^[5]
- j. Preparation for required federal, state, and local assessments
- k. Delivery of assessments
- l. Utilizing results of assessments

None	Less than or equal to 1 hour	More than 1 hour but less than or equal to 3 hours	More than 3 hours but less than or equal to 5 hours	More than 5 hours but less than or equal to 10 hours	More than 10 hours
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

[1] Collaborative time includes time spent working with other teachers within or across grade and subject areas as part of a Professional Learning Community to plan and assess instructional strategies.

[2] Supervisory duties include hall monitoring, recess, bus and cafeteria coverage, etc.

[3] Paperwork means both electronic and paper forms and documentation that must be completed to comply with federal, state and local policies. This includes the use of the state-approved electronic platform (i.e., CIITS, EDS).

[4] The teacher evaluation process is a cycle of performance improvement which includes self-assessment, goal-setting and performance planning, observations, coaching and feedback sessions, collecting artifacts and evidence of student growth, and an annual written evaluation report/summary. This includes the use of PGES.

[5] Professional learning includes all opportunities, formal and informal, where adults learn from one another including graduate courses, in service, workshops, conferences, professional learning communities and other meetings focused on improving teaching and learning.

* Kentucky specific questions

In an AVERAGE week of teaching, how many hours do you spend on school-related activities outside of the regular school work day (before or after school, and/or on weekends)?

- ☐ None
- ☐ Less than or equal to 1 hour
- ☐ More than 1 hour but less than or equal to 3 hours
- ☐ More than 3 hours but less than or equal to 5 hours
- ☐ More than 5 hours but less than or equal to 10 hours
- ☐ More than 10 hours

FACILITIES AND RESOURCES

Please rate how strongly you agree or disagree with the following statements about your school facilities and resources.

- a. Teachers^[1] have sufficient access to appropriate instructional materials^[2].
- b. Teachers have sufficient access to instructional technology, including computers, printers, software and internet access.
- c. Teachers have sufficient support to use effectively the state-approved electronic platform (i.e., CIITS, EDS).*
- d. Teachers have access to reliable communication technology, including phones, faxes and email.
- e. Teachers have sufficient access to office equipment and supplies such as copy machines, paper, pens, etc.
- f. Teachers have sufficient access to a broad range of professional support personnel^[3].
- g. The school environment is clean and well maintained.
- h. Teachers have adequate space to work productively.
- i. The physical environment of classrooms in this school supports teaching and learning.
- j. The reliability and speed of Internet connections in this school are sufficient to support instructional practices.
- k. Teachers have sufficient access to the library and media facilities.

Strongly disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly agree	Don't know
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

[1] Teachers means a majority of teachers in your school.

[2] Instructional materials include items such as textbooks, curriculum materials, content references, etc.

[3] Professional support personnel includes other educators such as school counselors, nurses, school psychologists and social workers, library media specialists, etc.

* Kentucky specific questions

COMMUNITY SUPPORT AND INVOLVEMENT

Please rate how strongly you agree or disagree with the following statements about community support and involvement in your school.

- Parents/guardians are influential decision makers in this school
- This school maintains clear, two-way communication with the community.
- This school does a good job of encouraging parent/guardian involvement.
- Teachers^[1] provide parents/guardians with useful information about student learning.
- Parents/guardians know what is going on in this school.
- Parents/guardians support teachers, contributing to their success with students.
- Community members support teachers, contributing to their success with students.
- The community we serve is supportive of this school.

Strongly disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly agree	Don't know
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

[1] Teachers means a majority of teachers in your school.

MANAGING STUDENT CONDUCT

Please rate how strongly you agree or disagree with the following statements about managing student conduct in your school.

- Students at this school understand expectations for their conduct.
- Students at this school follow rules of conduct.
- Policies and procedures about student conduct are clearly understood by the faculty.
- School administrators consistently enforce rules for student conduct.
- School administrators support teachers^[1] efforts to maintain discipline in the classroom.
- Teachers consistently enforce rules for student conduct.
- The faculty work in a school environment that is safe.

Strongly disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly agree	Don't know
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

[1] Teachers means a majority of teachers in your school

TEACHER LEADERSHIP

Please rate how strongly you agree or disagree with the following statements about leadership in your school.

- Teachers^[1] are recognized as educational experts.
- Teachers are trusted to make sound professional decisions about instruction.
- Teachers are relied upon to make decisions about educational issues.
- Teachers are encouraged to participate in school leadership roles^[2].
- The faculty has an effective process for making group decisions to solve problems.
- In this school we take steps to solve problems.
- Teachers are effective leaders in this school.

Strongly disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly agree	Don't know
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

[1] Teachers means a majority of teachers in your school.

[2] Formal roles may include: department chair, member of the school improvement team, elected member of site-based decision-making council, mentor/resource teacher, coach, or leader of a professional learning community.

Please indicate the role teachers^[1] have at your school in the following areas.

- Selecting instructional materials and resources
- Devising teaching techniques
- Setting grading and student assessment practices
- Determining the content of in-service professional learning programs
- Establishing student discipline procedures

- f. Providing input on how the school budget will be spent
- g. Selecting teachers new to this school
- h. Planning school improvement
- i. Leading professional learning*
- j. Modeling instructional methods, assessments, and/or classroom management*

No role at all	Small role	Moderate role	Large role	Don't Know
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

[1] Teachers means a majority of teachers in your school.

* Kentucky specific questions

Teachers^[1] have an appropriate level of influence on decision making in this school.

- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Disagree
- ☐ Agree
- ☐ Strongly agree
- ☐ Don't know

[1] Teachers means a majority of teachers in your school.

SCHOOL LEADERSHIP

Please rate how strongly you agree or disagree with the following statements about school leadership in your school.

- a. The faculty and leadership have a shared vision.
- b. There is an atmosphere of trust and mutual respect in this school.
- c. Teachers^[1] feel comfortable raising issues and concerns that are important to them.
- d. The school leadership^[2] consistently supports teachers.
- e. Teachers are held to high professional standards for delivering instruction.
- f. The school leadership facilitates using data to improve student learning.
- g. Teacher performance is assessed objectively.

- h. Teachers receive feedback that can help them improve teaching.
- i. The procedures for teacher evaluation are consistent.
- j. The school improvement team provides effective leadership at this school.
- k. The faculty are recognized for accomplishments.

Strongly disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly agree	Don't know
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

[1] Teachers means a majority of teachers in your school.

[2] School leadership includes individuals, groups of individuals, and/or teams within the school that focus on managing complex operations This may include scheduling; ensuring a safe school environment; reporting on students' academic, social and behavioral performance; using resources to provide the textbooks and instructional materials necessary for teaching and learning; overseeing the care and maintenance of the physical plant; or developing and implementing the school budget.

The school leadership^[1] makes a sustained effort to address teacher concerns about:

- a. Leadership issues
- b. Facilities and resources
- c. The use of time in my school
- d. Professional learning
- e. Teacher leadership
- f. Community support and involvement
- g. Managing student conduct
- h. Instructional practices and support
- i. New teacher support

Strongly disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly agree	Don't know
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

[1] School leadership includes individuals, groups of individuals, and/or teams within the school that focus on managing complex operations This may include scheduling; ensuring a safe school environment; reporting on students' academic, social and behavioral performance; using resources to provide the textbooks and instructional materials necessary for teaching and learning; overseeing the care and maintenance of the physical plant; or developing and implementing the school budget.

Please rate how strongly you agree or disagree with the following statements about the school council in your school.*

- a. Teachers^[1] on the school council are representative of the faculty (i.e. experience, subject/grade, etc.).*
- b. Parents on the school council are representative of the diversity within the school community.*
- c. The school council makes decisions that positively impact instruction (i.e. curriculum, instructional practices, etc.).*
- d. The school council makes decisions that positively impact school staffing and schedules.*
- e. Overall, the school council provides effective leadership in this school.*

Strongly disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly agree	Don't know
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

[1] Teachers means a majority of teachers in your school.

* Kentucky specific questions

PROFESSIONAL LEARNING

Please rate how strongly you agree or disagree with the following statements about professional learning in your school.

- a. Sufficient resources are available for professional learning^[1] in my school.
- b. An appropriate amount of time is provided for professional learning.
- c. Professional learning offerings are data driven.
- d. Professional learning opportunities are aligned with the school's improvement plan.
- e. Professional learning is differentiated to meet the needs of individual teachers^[2].
- f. Decision making about professional learning is guided by evidence from the growth and effectiveness system.
- g. Professional learning deepens teachers' content knowledge.*
- h. Teachers have sufficient training to fully utilize instructional technology.
- i. Teachers are encouraged to reflect on their own practice.
- j. In this school, follow up is provided from professional learning.

- k. Professional learning provides ongoing opportunities for teachers to work with colleagues to refine teaching practices.
- l. Professional learning is evaluated and results are communicated to teachers.
- m. Professional learning enhances teachers' ability to implement instructional strategies that meet diverse student learning needs.
- n. Professional learning enhances teachers' abilities to improve student learning.
- o. Teachers contribute to the planning, selection, and/or design of professional learning.*

Strongly disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly agree	Don't know
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

[1] Professional learning includes all opportunities, formal and informal, where adults learn from one another including in service, workshops, conferences, professional learning communities and other meetings focused on improving teaching and learning.

[2] Teachers means a majority of teachers in your school.

* Kentucky specific questions

In which of the following areas (if any) do you need professional learning to teach your standard more effectively?

- a. Your content area
- b. Kentucky Academic Standards*
- c. Student assessment
- d. Differentiating instruction
- e. Special education (students with disabilities)
- f. Special education (gifted and talented)
- g. English Language Learners

- h. Closing the Achievement Gap
- i. Methods of teaching
- j. Reading strategies
- k. Integrating technology into instruction
- l. Classroom management techniques

Yes	No
☐	☐
☐	☐
☐	☐
☐	☐
☐	☐
☐	☐
☐	☐
☐	☐
☐	☐
☐	☐
☐	☐
☐	☐
☐	☐

** Kentucky specific questions*

In the past 2 years, have you had 10 hours or more of professional learning in any of the following areas?

- a. Your content area
- b. Kentucky Academic Standards*
- c. Student assessment
- d. Differentiating instruction
- e. Special education (students with disabilities)
- f. Special education (gifted and talented)
- g. English Language Learners
- h. Closing the Achievement Gap
- i. Methods of teaching
- j. Reading strategies
- k. Integrating technology into instruction
- l. Classroom management techniques

Yes	No
☐	☐
☐	☐
☐	☐
☐	☐
☐	☐
☐	☐
☐	☐
☐	☐
☐	☐
☐	☐
☐	☐
☐	☐

** Kentucky specific questions*

INSTRUCTIONAL PRACTICES AND SUPPORT

Please rate how strongly you agree or disagree with the following statements about instructional practices and support in your school.

- State assessment^[1] data are available in time to impact instructional practices.
- Local assessment^[2] data are available in time to impact instructional practices.
- Teachers^[3] use assessment data to inform their instruction.
- Teachers work in professional learning communities^[4] to develop and align instructional practices.
- Provided supports (i.e. instructional coaching, professional learning communities, etc.) translate to improvements in instructional practices by teachers.
- Teachers are encouraged to try new things to improve instruction.
- Teachers are assigned classes that maximize their likelihood of success with students.
- Teachers have autonomy to make decisions about instructional delivery (i.e. pacing, materials and pedagogy).
- The curriculum taught in this school is aligned with the Kentucky Academic Standards.
- An appropriate amount of instructional time is spent on required local assessments in this school.*

Strongly disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly agree	Don't know
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

[1] State assessments include end of course and end of grade tests.

[2] Local assessments are standardized instruments offered across schools within the district and can include any norm or criterion referenced tests, diagnostics, or local benchmarks.

[3] Teachers means a majority of teachers in your school.

[4] Professional learning communities include formalized groupings of teachers within or across grade and subject areas that meet regularly to plan and assess instructional strategies for student success.

* Kentucky specific questions

OVERALL

Which of the following best describes your immediate professional plans? (Select one.)

- ☐ Continue teaching at my current school
- ☐ Continue teaching in this district, but leave this school
- ☐ Continue teaching in this state, but leave this district
- ☐ Continue working in education, but pursue an administrative position
- ☐ Continue working in education, but pursue a non-administrative position
- ☐ Leave education entirely

Which aspect of your teaching most affects your willingness to keep teaching at your school? (Select one.)

- ☐ Time during the work day
- ☐ Facilities and resources
- ☐ Community support and involvement
- ☐ Managing student conduct

- ☐ Teacher leadership
- ☐ School leadership
- ☐ Professional learning
- ☐ Instructional practices and support

Which aspect of your teaching conditions is most important to you in promoting student learning? (Select one.)

- ☐ Time during the work day
- ☐ Facilities and resources
- ☐ Community support and involvement
- ☐ Managing student conduct
- ☐ Teacher leadership
- ☐ School leadership
- ☐ Professional learning
- ☐ Instructional practices and support

Overall, my school is a good place to work and learn.

- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Disagree
- ☐ Agree
- ☐ Strongly agree
- ☐ Don't know

At this school, we utilize the results from the TELL Kentucky Survey as a tool for school improvement.

- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Disagree
- ☐ Agree
- ☐ Strongly agree
- ☐ Don't know

NEW TEACHER SUPPORT

As a beginning teacher, I have received the following kinds of supports during this current school year.

- a. Formally assigned resource teacher/mentor.
- b. Seminars specifically designed for new teachers
- c. Reduced workload
- d. Common planning time with other teachers
- e. Release time to observe other teachers
- f. Formal time to meet with mentor during school hours
- g. Orientation for new teachers
- h. Access to professional learning communities where I could discuss concerns with other teacher(s)
- i. Regular communication with principals, other administrator or department chair
- j. Participation in the KTIP program*
- k. Other
- l. I received no additional support as a new teacher.

Yes	No
☐	☐
☐	☐
☐	☐
☐	☐
☐	☐
☐	☐
☐	☐
☐	☐
☐	☐
☐	☐
☐	☐
☐	☐

* Kentucky specific questions

On average, how often did you engage in each of the following activities with your resource teacher/mentor during the current school year?

- a. Developing lesson plans
- b. Being observed teaching by my resource teacher/mentor
- c. Observing my resource teacher's/mentor's teaching
- d. Analyzing student work
- e. Reviewing results of students' assessments
- f. Addressing student or classroom behavioral issues
- g. Reflecting on and discussing the effectiveness of my teaching
- h. Aligning my lesson planning with the state curriculum and local curriculum
- i. Other

Never	Less than once per month	Once per month	Several times per month	Once per week	Almost daily
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

How much did the support you received from your resource teacher/mentor influence your practice in the following areas during this current school year?

- Instructional strategies
- Subject matter I teach
- Classroom management strategies
- Using data to identify student needs
- Differentiating instruction based upon individual student needs and characteristics
- Creating a supportive, equitable classroom where differences are valued
- Enlisting the help of family members, parents and/or guardians
- Working collaboratively with other teachers at my school
- Connecting with key resource professionals (e.g., coaches, counselors, etc.)
- Complying with policies and procedures
- Completing administrative paperwork
- Providing emotional support
- Other

Not at all	Hardly at all	Some	Quite a bit	A great deal
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

Please indicate whether each of the following were true for you and your resource teacher/mentor for this current school year.

- a. My resource teacher/mentor and I were in the same building.
- b. My resource teacher/mentor and I taught in the same content area.
- c. My resource teacher/mentor and I taught the same grade level.

Yes

No

☐☐☐☐☐☐

Overall, the additional support I received as a new teacher during this current school year improved my instructional practice.

☐ Strongly disagree

☐ Disagree

☐ Agree

☐ Strongly agree

☐ Don't know

Overall, the additional support I received as a new teacher during this current school year has been important in my decision to continue teaching at this school.

☐ Strongly disagree

☐ Disagree

☐ Agree

☐ Strongly agree

☐ Don't know

APPENDIX C: GROUP LEVEL ASSESSMENT

Vaughn, L. M. & Lohmueller, M. (2014). Calling all stakeholders: Group-level assessment (GLA)—A qualitative and participatory method for large groups. *Evaluation Review*, 38(4), 336-355.

“Group-level assessment (GLA) is a qualitative and participatory large group method in which timely and valid data are collaboratively generated and interactively evaluated with relevant stakeholders leading to the development of participant-driven data and relevant action plans” (p. 336).

“The benefits to using GLA are numerous, including (a) hidden agendas and problematic issues are often revealed, (b) stakeholders are responsible for honesty in presentation and validity of data, (c) phenomena under investigation are shaped by the interaction of multiple purposes and agendas, (d) and stakeholders are more likely to ‘buy into’ data they generate and evaluate, therefore they are more ready to act on the outcomes of the process” (p. 346).

Process

Preparation: Write prompts on large chart paper and place on walls. Cover until Step 2 to avoid distraction (easiest to just fold paper upward from bottom and tape until ready to expose). Good to have as many as 1.5 as many flipcharts as participants.

340

Evaluation Review 38(4)

Prompts should generally be a balance of:

- Open-ended and structured
- Strengths and weaknesses
- Positive and negative
- Specific and broad
- Silly and serious

Sample prompts are included below.

Step 1: Climate Setting

Trust building. Overview of GLA process and what will occur. Ice-breaker or warm-up exercise useful when participants do not know each other.

Step 2: Generating

Participants are given markers (can be one color to maintain the most anonymity) and go around the room responding to the prompts. If they agree with another's statement, place a check or star next to it.

Step 3: Appreciating

Participants spend a short time walking around looking at all the responses to get an overview, encouraged to interact and discuss. They might also like to add stars/checks to some more of other people's responses.

Step 4: Reflecting

Figure 1. Group-level assessment (GLA) process.

Participants spend a short time thinking on their own about the data as a whole, might jot down initial thoughts or observations.

Step 5: Understanding

Participants are divided into smaller groups of 5-8 and assigned 5-6 charts. They discuss and look for *themes across* the set of charts, analyzing the data from their perspectives. Good to give examples to avoid participants looking for main ideas on each chart. Can have facilitators for each group. After, groups come together and report verbally their most commonly occurring themes, facilitator records for everyone to see.

Step 6: Selecting

Participants clarify the most important ideas, distilling the themes from Step 5. This can be done as a large group with the primary facilitator, or in self-facilitated small groups. This step might also include some type of prioritization process, with participants individually placing dots or rankings next to their own priority themes, for example. Themes not selected might not be completely discarded, but “parked” on a separate list for consideration at a later date.

Step 7: Action

Large group considers possible next steps based on priorities, informing relevant future programs, interventions, developments, or other change. Can choose to then break into smaller groups for specific action planning. This step can also be scheduled at a separate time for those interested in being involved in the action, if this makes more sense.

Table 1. Examples of GLA Prompts Organized by Category.

Open Ended	Structured
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We need to do more.... • We need to do less.... • Hopes/Dreams (related to group or topic) • _____(group or topic) is really about... 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Our potential for action would be enhanced if we.... • Most important areas to address (list areas with Likert-type scale 1 to 5)
Strengths	Weaknesses
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As we move forward, we need to consider... • Best part of our group? • We are awesome because 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The worst mistake we could make... • Our toughest problem to address is... • In order to be more effective we should... • Biggest barriers to success?
Positive	Negative
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We can be proud we.... • We are exceptional because we.... • Potential assets? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We usually remain silent about... • What's hidden? (in our group or about the topic)
Specific	Broad
<p>The roadblock to our success is...</p> <p>Best way for us to support people?</p> <p>Key collaborators include:</p>	<p>Let's start/Let's stop....</p> <p>We definitely need...</p> <p>Related to (topic or group), I wish....</p>
Silly	Serious
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Draw a bumper sticker (group or related to the topic) • If our group was an animal... • Theme song (represents our group or the topic) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In 3 years, we need to be... • _____is usually ignored (in group or within topic) • To improve the functioning of our group, we need to...

APPENDIX D: INFORMED CONSENT

Investigator(s) name & address:

Advisor and Principal Investigator:

W. Kyle Ingle, Ph.D.
Educational Leadership, Evaluation, & Organizational Development
The University of Louisville
1905 South 1st Street
Louisville, Kentucky 40292
(502) 852-6097

Kristy Field
University of Louisville
523 Arcadia Park
Lexington, KY 40503; kristy.field@louisville.edu

Site(s) where study is to be conducted: Bryan Station High School, Fayette County Public Schools.

Phone number for subjects to call for questions: Kristy Field at (859) 797-3800

Introduction and Background Information

You are invited to participate in a research study. The study is being conducted by Kristy Field (doctoral student). The study is sponsored by the University of Louisville, Department of Educational Leadership, Evaluation and Organizational Development (ELEOD). The study will take place at Bryan Station High School in Fayette County Public Schools. Approximately twenty subjects will be invited to participate.

Purpose

The purpose of this study is to examine how teachers in an academy structure perceive collegial collaboration.

Procedures

In this study, you will be asked to provide demographic information and information about your past and present experiences in education. You will also be asked to

participate in a Group Level Assessment to identify themes pertaining to your experiences with collegial collaboration as it relates to school structure (60 minutes). Your participation will include a pre-GLA survey to collect demographic information (5 minutes). You will have the opportunity to review my final research findings. The GLA will take place via Zoom and Google Docs and will be recorded. The GLA phase of this project will conclude by August 1, 2020.

Potential Risks

There are no foreseeable risks other than possible discomfort in answering personal questions.

Benefits

The possible benefits of this study include the opportunity for FCPS and other school districts to include my finding as part of their decision making process as it relates to school structure. The possible benefits to society include the preparation of students for post-secondary education and the global job market. The information collected may not benefit you directly. The information learned in this study may be helpful to others.

Compensation

You will not be compensated for your time, inconvenience, or expenses while you are in this study.

Security

Total privacy cannot be guaranteed. Your privacy will be protected to the extent permitted by law. If the results from this study are published, your name will not be made public; pseudonyms will be used, and participants will be identified by letter. While unlikely, the following may look at the study records:

The University of Louisville Institutional Review Board, and the Human Subjects Protection Program Office.

People who are responsible for research and HIPAA oversight at the institutions where the study is conducted.

Government agencies, such as: Office for Human Research Protections (OHRP)

Conflict of Interest

This study involves no foreseeable conflict of interest.

Security

All data will be stored on a password-protected computer. Hard copy documents will be stored in a locked file at the investigator's home. Everything will be destroyed within six months of the study's completion.

Voluntary Participation

Taking part in this study is voluntary. You may choose not to take part at all. If you decide to be in this study you may stop taking part at any time. If you decide not to be in this study or if you stop taking part at any time, you will not lose any benefits for which you may qualify. You will be told about any changes that may affect your decision to continue in the study.

Contact Persons, Research Subject's Rights, Questions, Concerns, and Complaints

If you have any concerns or complaints about the study or the study staff, you have three options.

You may contact the principal investigator at (859) 797-3800 or kristy.field@louisville.edu.

If you have any questions about your rights as a study subject, questions, concerns or complaints, you may call the Human Subjects Protection Program Office (HSPPO) (502) 852-5188. You may discuss any questions about your rights as a subject, in secret, with a

member of the Institutional Review Board (IRB) or the HSPPO staff. The IRB is an independent committee composed of members of the University community, staff of the institutions, as well as lay members of the community not connected with these institutions. The IRB has reviewed this study.

If you want to speak to a person outside the University, you may call 1-877-852-1167. You will be given the chance to talk about any questions, concerns or complaints in secret. This is a 24 hour hot line answered by people who do not work at the University of Louisville.

Acknowledgment and Signatures

This informed consent document is not a contract. This document tells you what will happen during the study if you choose to take part. Your signature indicates that this study has been explained to you, that your questions have been answered, and that you agree to take part in the study. You are not giving up any legal rights to which you are entitled by signing this informed consent document. You will be given a copy of this consent form to keep for your records.

_____ Subject Name (Please Print)	_____ Signature of Subject	_____ Date Signed
_____ Printed Name of Legal Representative (if applicable)	_____ Signature of Legal Representative Date Signed	
_____ Relationship of Legal Representative to Subject		
_____ Printed Name of Person Explaining Consent Form	_____ Signature of Person Explaining Date Signed Consent Form (if other than the Investigator)	
_____ Printed Name of Investigator	_____ Signature of Investigator Date Signed	

List of Investigators:

Kristy Field

Phone Number:

(859) 797-3800

APPENDIX E: RECRUITMENT CORRESPONDENCE

Hello _____,

I hope this e-mail finds you well. My name is Kristy Field and I am a Doctoral Candidate in the Department of Educational Leadership, Evaluation and Organizational Development (ELEOD) at the University of Louisville. I am writing as I am conducting a case study on the high school academy structure and believe you would be able to provide critical insight.

The primary goal of my study is to investigate teacher perception of collegial collaboration in the academy structure. Thus, I am seeking to include in my research teachers at Bryan Station High School who have taught in both the non-academy and the academy structure. Your voice is of considerable importance to the study. My hope is that you will participate in a Group Level Assessment about your perception of teacher collegial collaboration in the academy structure.

I am asking that you participate in a 60-minute GLA. I plan to conduct a digital/virtual GLA prior to August 1st, 2020. If you have additional questions, please contact me via e-mail at kristy.field@louisville.edu or call (859)797-3800.

Thank you in advance and I look forward to your response.

Sincerely,

Kristy Field

Doctoral Candidate, Department of Educational Leadership, Evaluation and Organizational Development (ELEOD)

University of Louisville

APPENDIX F: TELL KENTUCKY 2017 SURVEY RESULTS

Report for TELL KY 2017

KENTUCKY 90.95% responded

FAYETTE COUNTY 90.91% responded

Time

Q2.1 Please rate how strongly you agree or disagree with the following statements about the use of time in your school.

☐ Strongly disagree
 ☐ Disagree
 ☐ Agree
 ☐ Strongly agree

a. Class sizes are reasonable such that teachers have the time available to meet the needs of all students.

b. Teachers have time available to collaborate with colleagues.

c. Teachers are allowed to focus on educating students with minimal interruptions

d. The non-instructional time provided for teachers in my school is sufficient.

e. Efforts are made to minimize the amount of routine paperwork teachers are required to do.

f. Teachers have sufficient instructional time to meet the needs of all students.

g. Teachers are protected from duties that interfere with their essential role of educating students.

Q2.2 In an average week, how much time do you devote to the following activities during the school day (i.e., time for which you are under contract to be at the school)?

a. Individual planning time

b. Collaborative planning time

c. Supervisory duties

d. Required committee and/or staff meetings

e. Completing required administrative paperwork

f. Preparing for/participating in the teacher evaluation process?

g. Communicating with parents/guardians and/or the community

h. Addressing student discipline issues

i. Professional learning

j. Preparation for required federal, state, and local assessments

k. Delivery of assessments

I. Utilizing results of assessments

Q2.3 In an average week of teaching, how many hours do you spend on school-related activities outside the regular school work day (before or after school, and/or on weekends)?

Facilities and Resources

Q3.1 Please rate how strongly you agree or disagree with the following statements about your school facilities and resources.

☐ Strongly disagree
 ☐ Disagree
 ☐ Agree
 ☐ Strongly agree

a. Teachers have sufficient access to appropriate instructional materials.

b. Teachers have sufficient access to instructional technology, including computers, printers, software and internet access.

c. Teachers have sufficient support to use effectively the state-approved electronic platform (i.e., CIITS, EDS).

d. Teachers have access to reliable communication technology, including phones, faxes and email.

e. Teachers have sufficient access to office equipment and supplies such as copy machines, paper, pens, etc.

f. Teachers have sufficient access to a broad range of professional support personnel.

g. The school environment is clean and well maintained.

h. Teachers have adequate space to work productively.

i. The physical environment of classrooms in this school supports teaching and learning.

j. The reliability and speed of Internet connections in this school are sufficient to support instructional practices.

k. Teachers have sufficient access to the library and media facilities.

Community Support and Involvement

Q4.1 Please rate how strongly you agree or disagree with the following statements about community support and involvement in your school.

☐ Strongly disagree
 ☐ Disagree
 ☐ Agree
 ☐ Strongly agree

a. Parents/guardians are influential decision makers in this school.

b. This school maintains clear, two-way communication with the community.

c. This school does a good job of encouraging parent/guardian involvement.

d. Teachers provide parents/guardians with useful information about student learning.

e. Parents/guardians know what is going on in this school.

f. Parents/guardians support teachers, contributing to their success with students.

g. Community members support teachers, contributing to their success with students.

h. The community we serve is supportive of this school.

Managing Student Conduct

Q5.1 Please rate how strongly you agree or disagree with the following statements about managing student conduct in your school.

Strongly disagree Disagree Agree Strongly agree

a. Students at this school understand expectations for their conduct.

b. Students at this school follow rules of conduct.

c. Policies and procedures about student conduct are clearly understood by the faculty.

d. School administrators consistently enforce rules for student conduct.

e. School administrators support teachers' efforts to maintain discipline in the classroom.

f. Teachers consistently enforce rules for student conduct.

g. The faculty work in a school environment that is safe.

Teacher Leadership

Q6.1 Please rate how strongly you agree or disagree with the following statements about teacher leadership in your school.

☐ Strongly disagree
 ☐ Disagree
 ☐ Agree
 ☐ Strongly agree

a. Teachers are recognized as educational experts.

b. Teachers are trusted to make sound professional decisions about instruction.

c. Teachers are relied upon to make decisions about educational issues.

d. Teachers are encouraged to participate in school leadership roles.

e. The faculty has an effective process for making group decisions to solve problems.

f. In this school we take steps to solve problems.

g. Teachers are effective leaders in this school.

Q6.2 Please indicate the role teachers have at your school in each of the following areas.

☐ No role at all
 ☐ Small role
 ☐ Moderate role
 ☐ Large role

a. Selecting instructional materials and resources

b. Devising teaching techniques

c. Setting grading and student assessment practices

d. Determining the content of in-service professional learning programs

e. Establishing student discipline procedures

f. Providing input on how the school budget will be spent

g. Selecting teachers new to this school

h. Planning school improvement

i. Leading professional learning

j. Modeling instructional methods, assessments, and/or classroom management

Q6.5 Teachers have an appropriate level of influence on decision making in this school.

Strongly disagree Disagree Agree Strongly agree

School Leadership

Q7.1 Please rate how strongly you agree or disagree with the following statements about school leadership in your school.

☐ Strongly disagree
 ☐ Disagree
 ☐ Agree
 ☐ Strongly agree

a. The faculty and leadership have a shared vision.

b. There is an atmosphere of trust and mutual respect in this school.

c. Teachers feel comfortable raising issues and concerns that are important to them.

d. The school leadership consistently supports teachers.

e. Teachers are held to high professional standards for delivering instruction.

f. The school leadership facilitates using data to improve student learning.

g. Teacher performance is assessed objectively.

h. Teachers receive feedback that can help them improve teaching.

i. The procedures for teacher evaluation are consistent.

j. The school improvement team provides effective leadership at this school.

k. The faculty are recognized for accomplishments.

Q7.3 The school leadership makes a sustained effort to address teacher concerns about:

Strongly disagree
 Disagree
 Agree
 Strongly agree

a. Leadership issues

b. Facilities and resources

c. The use of time in my school

d. Professional learning

e. Teacher leadership

f. Community support and involvement

g. Managing student conduct

h. Instructional practices and support

i. New teacher support

Q7.4 Please rate how strongly you agree or disagree with the following statements about the school council in your school.

☐ Strongly disagree
 ☐ Disagree
 ☐ Agree
 ☐ Strongly agree

a. Teachers on the school council are representative of the faculty (i.e. experience, subject/grade, etc.)

b. Parents on the school council are representative of the diversity within the school community.

c. The school council makes decisions that positively impact instruction (i.e. curriculum, instructional practices, etc.).

d. The school council makes decisions that positively impact school staffing and schedules.

e. Overall, the school council provides effective leadership in this school.

Professional Learning

Q8.1 Please rate how strongly you agree or disagree with statements about professional learning in your school.

Strongly disagree Disagree Agree Strongly agree

a. Sufficient resources are available for professional learning in my school.

b. An appropriate amount of time is provided for professional learning.

c. Professional learning offerings are data driven.

d. Professional learning opportunities are aligned with the school's improvement plan.

e. Professional learning is differentiated to meet the needs of individual teachers.

f. Decision making about professional learning is guided by evidence from the growth and effectiveness system.

g. Professional learning deepens teachers' content knowledge.

h. Teachers have sufficient training to fully utilize instructional technology.

i. Teachers are encouraged to reflect on their own practice.

j. In this school, follow up is provided from professional learning.

k. Professional learning provides ongoing opportunities for teachers to work with colleagues to refine teaching practices.

l. Professional learning is evaluated and results are communicated to teachers.

m. Professional learning enhances teachers' ability to implement instructional strategies that meet diverse student learning needs.

n. Professional learning enhances teachers' abilities to improve student learning.

o. Teachers contribute to the planning, selection, and/or design of professional learning.

Q8.2 In which of the following areas (if any) do you need professional learning to teach your students more effectively?

☐ Yes ☐ No

a. Your content area

b. Kentucky Academic Standards

c. Student assessment

d. Differentiating instruction

e. Special education (students with disabilities)

f. Special education (gifted and talented)

g. English Language Learners

h. Closing the Achievement Gap

i. Methods of teaching

j. Reading strategies

k. Integrating technology into instruction

l. Classroom management techniques

Q8.3 In the past 2 years have you had 10 clock hours or more of professional learning in any of the following areas?

☐ Yes ☐ No

a. Your content area

b. Kentucky Academic Standards

c. Student assessment

d. Differentiating instruction

e. Special education (students with disabilities)

f. Special education (gifted and talented)

g. English Language Learners

h. Closing the Achievement Gap

i. Methods of teaching

j. Reading strategies

k. Integrating technology into instruction

l. Classroom management techniques

Instructional Practices and Support

Q9.1 Please rate how strongly you agree or disagree with the following statements about instructional practices and support in your school.

Strongly disagree Disagree Agree Strongly agree

a. State assessment data are available in time to impact instructional practices.

b. Local assessment data are available in time to impact instructional practices.

c. Teachers use assessment data to inform their instruction.

d. Teachers work in professional learning communities to develop and align instructional practices.

e. Provided supports (i.e. instructional coaching, professional learning communities, etc.) translate to improvements in instructional practices by teachers.

f. Teachers are encouraged to try new things to improve instruction.

g. Teachers are assigned classes that maximize their likelihood of success with students.

h. Teachers have autonomy to make decisions about instructional delivery (i.e. pacing, materials and pedagogy).

i. The curriculum taught in this school is aligned with Kentucky Academic Standards.

j. An appropriate amount of instructional time is spent on required local assessments in this school.

Overall

Q10.1 Which of the following best describes your immediate professional plans? (Select one.)

- ☐ Continue teaching at my current school
- ☐ Continue teaching in this district but leave this school
- ☐ Continue teaching in this state but leave this district
- ☐ Continue working in education but pursue an administrative position
- ☐ Continue working in education but pursue a non-administrative position
- ☐ Leave education entirely

Q10.3 Which aspect of your teaching conditions most affects your willingness to keep teaching at your school? (Select one.)

- ☐ Time during the work day
- ☐ Facilities and resources
- ☐ Community support and involvement
- ☐ Managing student conduct
- ☐ Teacher leadership
- ☐ School leadership
- ☐ Professional learning
- ☐ Instructional practices and support

Q10.5 Which aspect of your teaching conditions is most important to you in promoting student learning? (Select one.)

- ☐ Time during the work day
- ☐ Facilities and resources
- ☐ Community support and involvement
- ☐ Managing student conduct
- ☐ Teacher leadership
- ☐ School leadership
- ☐ Professional learning
- ☐ Instructional practices and support

Q10.6 Overall, my school is a good place to work and learn.

- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Disagree
- ☐ Agree
- ☐ Strongly agree

Q10.7 At this school, we utilize the results from the TELL Kentucky Survey as a tool for school improvement.

- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Disagree
- ☐ Agree
- ☐ Strongly agree

New Teacher Support

Q11.1 As a beginning teacher, I have received the following kinds of supports during this current school year.

☐ Yes

☐ No

a. Formally assigned resource teacher/mentor

b. Seminars specifically designed for new teachers

c. Reduced workload

d. Common planning time with other teachers

e. Release time to observe other teachers

f. Formal time to meet with mentor during school hours

g. Orientation for new teachers

h. Access to professional learning communities where I could discuss concerns with other teacher(s)

i. Regular communication with principals, other administrator or department chair

j. Participation in the KTIP program

k. Other

l. I received no additional support as a new teacher.

Q11.2 On average, how often did you engage in each of the following activities with your resource teacher/mentor during this current school year?

a. Developing lesson plans

b. Being observed teaching by my resource teacher/mentor

c. Observing my resource teacher's/mentor's teaching

d. Analyzing student work

e. Reviewing results of students' assessments

f. Addressing student or classroom behavioral issues

g. Reflecting on and discussing the effectiveness of my teaching

h. Aligning my lesson planning with the state curriculum and local curriculum

i. Other

Q11.3 How much did the support you received from your resource teacher/mentor influence your practice in the following areas during this current school year?

a. Instructional strategies

b. Subject matter I teach

c. Classroom management strategies

d. Using data to identify student needs

e. Differentiating instruction based upon individual student needs and characteristics

f. Creating a supportive, equitable classroom where differences are valued

g. Enlisting the help of family members, parents and/or guardians

h. Working collaboratively with other teachers at my school

i. Connecting with key resource professionals (e.g., coaches, counselors, etc.)

j. Complying with policies and procedures

k. Completing administrative paperwork

I. Providing emotional support

m. Other

Q11.4 Please indicate whether each of the following were true for you and your resource teacher/mentor during this current school year.

☐ Yes ☐ No

a. My resource teacher/mentor and I were in the same building.

b. My resource teacher/mentor and I taught in the same content area.

c. My resource teacher/mentor and I taught the same grade level.

Q11.5 Overall, the additional support I received as a new teacher during this current school year improved my instructional practice.

☐ Strongly disagree ☐ Disagree ☐ Agree ☐ Strongly agree

Q11.6 Overall, the additional support I received as a new teacher during this current school year has helped me to impact my students' learning.

☐ Strongly disagree
 ☐ Disagree
 ☐ Agree
 ☐ Strongly agree

Q11.7 Overall, the additional support I received as a new teacher during this current school year has been important in my decision to continue teaching at this school.

☐ Strongly disagree
 ☐ Disagree
 ☐ Agree
 ☐ Strongly agree

APPENDIX G: KENTUCKY TELL SURVEY 2015 AND 2017 RESULTS
COMPARISON

School Summary Comparison Results TELL KY 2017

BRYAN STATION HIGH SCHOOL (TELL KY 2017) 65.00% responded

Bryan Station HS (TELL KY 2015) 100.00% responded

% Agree

BRYAN STATION
HIGH SCHOOL
TELL KY 2017

Bryan Station HS
TELL KY 2015

Time

Q2.1 Please rate how strongly you agree or disagree with the following statements about the use of time in your school.

a. Class sizes are reasonable such that teachers have the time available to meet the needs of all students.

53.2%

23.5%

b. Teachers have time available to collaborate with colleagues.

77.9%

35.3%

c. Teachers are allowed to focus on educating students with minimal interruptions

55.3%

28.3%

d. The non-instructional time provided for teachers in my school is sufficient.

65.8%

37.1%

e. Efforts are made to minimize the amount of routine paperwork teachers are required to do.

55.3%

18.6%

f. Teachers have sufficient instructional time to meet the needs of all students.

59.7%

40.7%

g. Teachers are protected from duties that interfere with their essential role of educating students.

55.3%

31.4%

BRYAN STATION HIGH SCHOOL (TELL KY 2017) 65.00% responded
 Bryan Station HS (TELL KY 2015) 100.00% responded

% Agree	
BRYAN STATION HIGH SCHOOL TELL KY 2017	Bryan Station HS TELL KY 2015

Facilities and Resources

Q3.1 Please rate how strongly you agree or disagree with the following statements about your school facilities and resources.

a. Teachers have sufficient access to appropriate instructional materials.	74.0%	72.6%
b. Teachers have sufficient access to instructional technology, including computers, printers, software and internet access.	71.4%	63.0%
c. Teachers have sufficient support to use effectively the state-approved electronic platform (i.e., CIITS, EDS).	85.1%	74.6%
d. Teachers have access to reliable communication technology, including phones, faxes and email.	97.4%	92.3%
e. Teachers have sufficient access to office equipment and supplies such as copy machines, paper, pens, etc.	66.2%	52.1%
f. Teachers have sufficient access to a broad range of professional support personnel.	87.2%	67.8%
g. The school environment is clean and well maintained.	94.8%	88.2%
h. Teachers have adequate space to work productively.	88.3%	94.9%
i. The physical environment of classrooms in this school supports teaching and learning.	89.5%	96.6%
j. The reliability and speed of Internet connections in this school are sufficient to support instructional practices.	85.7%	79.0%

BRYAN STATION HIGH SCHOOL (TELL KY 2017) 65.00% responded
 Bryan Station HS (TELL KY 2015) 100.00% responded

% Agree	
BRYAN STATION HIGH SCHOOL TELL KY 2017	Bryan Station HS TELL KY 2015

Community Support and Involvement

Q4.1 Please rate how strongly you agree or disagree with the following statements about community support and involvement in your school.

a. Parents/guardians are influential decision makers in this school.	54.2%	39.6%
b. This school maintains clear, two-way communication with the community.	92.0%	64.9%
c. This school does a good job of encouraging parent/guardian involvement.	85.5%	70.7%
d. Teachers provide parents/guardians with useful information about student learning.	92.3%	81.0%
e. Parents/guardians know what is going on in this school.	65.8%	50.4%
f. Parents/guardians support teachers, contributing to their success with students.	45.9%	39.8%
g. Community members support teachers, contributing to their success with students.	54.2%	53.5%
h. The community we serve is supportive of this school.	47.9%	43.0%

BRYAN STATION HIGH SCHOOL (TELL KY 2017) 65.00% responded

Bryan Station HS (TELL KY 2015) 100.00% responded

% Agree

BRYAN STATION
HIGH SCHOOL
TELL KY 2017

Bryan Station HS
TELL KY 2015

Managing Student Conduct

Q5.1 Please rate how strongly you agree or disagree with the following statements about managing student conduct in your school.

a. Students at this school understand expectations for their conduct.	73.7%	42.0%
b. Students at this school follow rules of conduct.	36.4%	10.8%
c. Policies and procedures about student conduct are clearly understood by the faculty.	73.3%	39.3%
d. School administrators consistently enforce rules for student conduct.	72.0%	23.5%
e. School administrators support teachers' efforts to maintain discipline in the classroom.	89.5%	38.5%
f. Teachers consistently enforce rules for student conduct.	45.9%	29.9%
g. The faculty work in a school environment that is safe.	92.1%	50.0%

BRYAN STATION HIGH SCHOOL (TELL KY 2017) 65.00% responded
 Bryan Station HS (TELL KY 2015) 100.00% responded

% Agree	
BRYAN STATION HIGH SCHOOL TELL KY 2017	Bryan Station HS TELL KY 2015

Teacher Leadership

Q6.1 Please rate how strongly you agree or disagree with the following statements about teacher leadership in your school.

a. Teachers are recognized as educational experts.	77.6%	68.1%
b. Teachers are trusted to make sound professional decisions about instruction.	81.3%	64.6%
c. Teachers are relied upon to make decisions about educational issues.	77.6%	65.5%
d. Teachers are encouraged to participate in school leadership roles.	80.0%	78.3%
e. The faculty has an effective process for making group decisions to solve problems.	59.7%	45.0%
f. In this school we take steps to solve problems.	81.3%	50.4%
g. Teachers are effective leaders in this school.	78.9%	63.2%
Q6.5 Teachers have an appropriate level of influence on decision making in this school.	52.8%	36.6%

BRYAN STATION HIGH SCHOOL (TELL KY 2017) 65.00% responded
 Bryan Station HS (TELL KY 2015) 100.00% responded

% Agree	
BRYAN STATION HIGH SCHOOL TELL KY 2017	Bryan Station HS TELL KY 2015

School Leadership

Q7.1 Please rate how strongly you agree or disagree with the following statements about school leadership in your school.

a. The faculty and leadership have a shared vision.	70.8%	39.1%
b. There is an atmosphere of trust and mutual respect in this school.	66.7%	43.6%
c. Teachers feel comfortable raising issues and concerns that are important to them.	63.0%	47.5%
d. The school leadership consistently supports teachers.	75.7%	43.2%
e. Teachers are held to high professional standards for delivering instruction.	84.2%	77.2%
f. The school leadership facilitates using data to improve student learning.	90.7%	82.0%
g. Teacher performance is assessed objectively.	79.2%	77.1%
h. Teachers receive feedback that can help them improve teaching.	83.6%	70.8%
i. The procedures for teacher evaluation are consistent.	79.7%	74.5%
j. The school improvement team provides effective leadership at this school.	83.3%	53.3%
k. The faculty are recognized for accomplishments.	81.6%	79.7%

Q7.3 The school leadership makes a sustained effort to address teacher concerns about:

a. Leadership issues	64.2%	42.6%
b. Facilities and resources	88.9%	75.0%
c. The use of time in my school	65.8%	43.8%
d. Professional learning	80.0%	73.8%
e. Teacher leadership	74.3%	63.5%
f. Community support and involvement	85.9%	61.5%
g. Managing student conduct	78.1%	40.2%
h. Instructional practices and support	79.2%	70.8%
i. New teacher support	74.6%	60.6%

Q7.4 Please rate how strongly you agree or disagree with the following statements about the school council in your school.

a. Teachers on the school council are representative of the faculty (i.e. experience, subject/grade, etc.)	86.1%	94.1%
b. Parents on the school council are representative of the diversity within the school community.	75.8%	63.8%
c. The school council makes decisions that positively impact instruction (i.e. curriculum, instructional practices, etc.).	90.9%	86.0%
d. The school council makes decisions that positively impact school staffing and schedules.	89.1%	77.8%
e. Overall, the school council provides effective leadership in this school.	90.9%	79.0%

BRYAN STATION HIGH SCHOOL (TELL KY 2017) 65.00% responded
 Bryan Station HS (TELL KY 2015) 100.00% responded

% Agree	
BRYAN STATION HIGH SCHOOL TELL KY 2017	Bryan Station HS TELL KY 2015

Professional Learning

Q8.1 Please rate how strongly you agree or disagree with statements about professional learning in your school.

a. Sufficient resources are available for professional learning in my school.	71.1%	78.9%
b. An appropriate amount of time is provided for professional learning.	76.6%	78.3%
c. Professional learning offerings are data driven.	75.4%	75.7%
d. Professional learning opportunities are aligned with the school's improvement plan.	87.1%	86.7%
e. Professional learning is differentiated to meet the needs of individual teachers.	60.8%	63.4%
f. Decision making about professional learning is guided by evidence from the growth and effectiveness system.	78.0%	73.3%
g. Professional learning deepens teachers' content knowledge.	65.3%	63.9%
h. Teachers have sufficient training to fully utilize instructional technology.	65.8%	N/A
i. Teachers are encouraged to reflect on their own practice.	94.7%	92.0%
j. In this school, follow up is provided from professional learning.	64.0%	51.9%
k. Professional learning provides ongoing opportunities for teachers to work with colleagues to refine teaching practices.	75.3%	65.1%
l. Professional learning is evaluated and results are communicated to teachers.	65.3%	45.0%
m. Professional learning enhances teachers' ability to implement instructional strategies that meet diverse student learning needs.	78.1%	77.6%
n. Professional learning enhances teachers' abilities to improve student learning.	78.1%	75.9%

BRYAN STATION HIGH SCHOOL (TELL KY 2017) 65.00% responded
 Bryan Station HS (TELL KY 2015) 100.00% responded

% Agree	
BRYAN STATION HIGH SCHOOL TELL KY 2017	Bryan Station HS TELL KY 2015

Instructional Practices and Support

Q9.1 Please rate how strongly you agree or disagree with the following statements about instructional practices and support in your school.

a. State assessment data are available in time to impact instructional practices.	52.8%	61.2%
b. Local assessment data are available in time to impact instructional practices.	79.7%	79.4%
c. Teachers use assessment data to inform their instruction.	86.3%	90.7%
d. Teachers work in professional learning communities to develop and align instructional practices.	94.7%	82.6%
e. Provided supports (i.e. instructional coaching, professional learning communities, etc.) translate to improvements in instructional practices by teachers.	83.6%	71.4%
f. Teachers are encouraged to try new things to improve instruction.	90.8%	87.1%
g. Teachers are assigned classes that maximize their likelihood of success with students.	60.8%	45.8%
h. Teachers have autonomy to make decisions about instructional delivery (i.e. pacing, materials and pedagogy).	83.8%	67.6%
i. The curriculum taught in this school is aligned with Kentucky Academic Standards.	100.0%	97.3%

BRYAN STATION HIGH SCHOOL (TELL KY 2017) 65.00% responded
 Bryan Station HS (TELL KY 2015) 100.00% responded

% Agree	
BRYAN STATION HIGH SCHOOL TELL KY 2017	Bryan Station HS TELL KY 2015

Overall

Q10.6 Overall, my school is a good place to work and learn.	90.7%	53.4%
Q10.7 At this school, we utilize the results from the TELL Kentucky Survey as a tool for school improvement.	74.5%	53.3%

APPENDIX H: GROUP LEVEL ASSESSMENT RESULTS

Prompt 1

Based on your experiences, describe teacher collaboration in the non-academy setting. Please consider positives, negatives, structures, what worked, what was lacking, what supported or discouraged teacher collaboration, etcetera.

Please do not click on this link until I tell you to do so.

- Prompt 2

Please type in the line with your name, all identifying information will be removed following the conclusion of the GLA.

A	Collaboration was mostly with similar content groups. We rarely talked to other departments. I did have more time with the science people which was helpful. The effectiveness varied by department. “Did what we needed to do to get the checkmark, but we did our own thing for the kids”
B	Depended on if collaboration was within topic or with IEP/504s, monitored by science chair, identical assessments, would discuss assessments, IEP/504 collaboration was “in the dark”, they were not part of the PLC meetings, collab with multiple co-teachers, getting lessons to them in timely manner was a problem
C	More flexibility with my ability to work with teachers in various settings; less structured approach to looking at the entirety of the EL population; more authentic buy-in for teachers who wanted to work with me about EL issues; no admin support for collaboration involving EL teachers/students; integration of EL teachers into content PLCs wasn’t monitored or mandated by admin “collab around EL was more authentic prior to AM” “flexibility to work with teachers in more creative ways instead of being mandated to a certain number of meetings per week” more authentic prior to AM
D	Collaboration typically occurred in PLCs, PLCs had little support and were self-sufficient so they either functioned or they didn’t. Admin didn’t really care if it functioned. Common planning was always a focus. There was a different PLC planning/data document almost every year. There seemed to always be confusion about the purpose of the PLC. <i>Led to lack of purpose for school</i>

E	I know it's helpful for teachers to have a set population to collaborate with other teachers for behavior and strategy brainstorming. I know the discussions about strategies that are universal across contents has helped the entire school. Before academies contents felt more on their own. Before academies it was harder to understand what students' academic lives were like outside of our own content. Planning for PLC was about what to get done for that unit or grade level, not much vertical planning (next class and/or pathway) ENGLISH
F	There wasn't much collaboration before the AM, most teachers only talked about their common assessments in their department meetings and those were usually run by the usual 1-2 people and the rest of us just went along with it.
G	For math, wasn't a huge change, let's make sure we have the same tests and everyday life was your own "on your own island". Teachers had different focuses, activities vs quizzes, different goals for students (understand what I teach them vs wanting them to be able to get to upper level problems
H	It depended on your department, I have been in some that were very collaborative and some that people didn't care at all and just did their own thing
I	We collaborated on our subject, but not much else. We rarely had student centered conversations because none of us had students in common, when we did have those conversations it was typically just to complain about how awful one kid was being in our class.
J	In a non-academy setting, most collaboration was done in departments or PLCs. The effectiveness of those really depended on the individuals involved as there wasn't a standard for PLCs to which we were held accountable. PLCs would have at least the same common assessment, but collaboration beyond that was lacking. We certainly did not engage in productive reflection on instructional strategies. We did have 9th grade "teams" of core teachers in which we'd talk about students to problem-solve various issues, send out failure letters, etc. There was opportunity for effective collaboration since we had a common plan with people teaching the same content. Most of the PLCs I participated in went above and beyond any expectations or support that was provided, but I don't know what went on in other departments. Aside from neighbors and hall duty partners, we didn't really collaborate in terms of academics or behavior, or get to know people outside of our department.

Prompt 2

Based on your experiences, describe teacher collaboration in the academy setting. Please consider positives, negatives, structures, what worked, what was lacking, what supported or discouraged teacher collaboration, etcetera.

Please do not click on this link until I tell you to do so.

- Prompt 3

Please type in the line with your name, all identifying information will be removed following the conclusion of the GLA.

A	Collaboration is much more interdisciplinary, but science collaboration has weakened due to time availability and lack of common planning at times. When we have common students, this helps to address issues as an academy and we can also share strategies that work for particular students or groups of students. Overall, there is more collaboration as a school. Again, this varies between academies and PLCs.
B	Collaboration with fellow PLC, we share ideas and lessons such as before, however, the gradebook is an issue (setting up for individual targets vs over all score), With IEP/504/EL, same: wish there was a way that our co-teachers could be a part of our meetings,
C	More structured, admin mandated for discussion in SLCs; collaboration feels less authentic and more driven by a need to “check a box;” EL students more likely to be focused on but implementation of strategies for improving EL performance are not followed up on outside of SLC discussion; EL teacher integration into PLCs is encouraged but not mandated by admin; I have less time to work with individual teachers because of meeting structures “Global students” miss supports, lack of authentic discussions, not effective for students in global situation (EL lens)
D	Global classes are a challenge when trying to collaborate between content areas, but academy specific classes lead to exciting opportunities for cross-curricular collaboration if other teachers are willing. PLCs haven’t received as much focus in English since the focus has shifted to SLC, and sometimes it is hard to get teachers to think in terms of PLC because they care more about SLC. Common planning for PLC is extremely important. Many more teachers are willing to try cross-curricular planning in the academy model.

	<p>Having more preps in the academy model makes planning more difficult.</p> <p>Difficult to support “global students” (AP, DC)</p> <p>AP and advanced enrollment has dropped off, not sure if this is due to AM, maybe emphasis on CTE courses</p>
E	<p>it’s easier to collaborate our support services now for behavior and mental health but it can sometimes be harder to collaborate for academics.</p> <p>Sometimes the SLC structure turns into checking off tasks instead of fruitful conversation and collaboration but I still think the academy and SLC structure creates more of a small learning feeling and community feeling for students and teachers. The overall feeling of the building has felt different since we changed. It is really hard for teachers with more than 1 or 2 preps to dig as deep into skills and units and PBL etc. Sharing of high yield strategies is helpful. Can be fruitful discussions, but hard to have 2 mandated meetings (or more if you are teacher leader). Can cause “burnout”, adding another thing causes purpose of academies to fall by the wayside</p>
F	<p>Being able to talk about content with one group and students with another is huge, we all know that a lot of what happens in our classrooms has nothing to do with the content we are actually teaching. I can talk about what is going on in their other classes and make more authentic connections now.</p>
G	<p>love that there is a principal assigned to each of our students, as they’re able to develop more consistent relationships with administration. Pre-AM it was harder to talk to other teachers about the same students, has helped academic success b/c I learned how to help my students more</p> <p>More teacher leaders in building, bigger divide b/t some who do 80-120% of work and those who do 20% of work, what is being asked of those who are not “teacher leaders”</p>
H	<p>PLCs and SLCs create the structure for effective collaboration, but the effectiveness of that collaboration still depends on the teachers and admin in those groups. Some admin are at every PLC and some show up every 4 meetings and are on their phone the entire time, some teachers are on their phones the entire time. Expectations have to be clear and enforced for it to work.</p>
I	<p>We have a really good group in our SLC and most of those in our PLC are good. I have been in two different academies so I have different experiences as far as collaboration in our SLCs, it depends a lot on the size of the academy</p>

	-- if it's too big it's hard to have student centered conversations because there are too many of them. Even in the best groups clear expectations are huge, some teachers are just there to check a box while some are there because they want to move the students and school forward.
J	In the academy structure, collaboration is more focused within our SLCs. The interdisciplinary nature allows teachers to discuss general instructional strategies and problem solve in focused ways around individual students (if the academies are pure, which they're not). This focus comes at the cost of having time to meet and plan with colleagues in PLCs. I would call the SLCs a high-cost, low-yield environment in terms of the amount of time/energy spent in SLCs compared to positive outcomes for students. We have had to be very intentional regarding sharing strategies for the classroom and for individual students. It seems like we'll get out of our SLCs what we put into them and a lot of teachers don't put much into them. The academy model also requires a shift in the number of preps per teacher. Collaboration is more important for our PLCs so that we can create effective instruction, yet we're not provided the time or priority to do this work with all of the other required training and meetings.

Prompt 3

Based on your experiences, what is needed for effective teacher collaboration in any school structure? Please give supporting details/reasons when possible.

Please do not click on this link until I tell you to do so.

- Ranking Order of Importance

Please type in the line with your name, all identifying information will be removed following the conclusion of the GLA.

A	The biggest thing we need is time together. Limiting excessive meetings, give academies and PLCs common planning but do not give a required checklist, increased effective accountability (Not an email or a gotcha, but a conversation of what is happening), admin support for academies and PLCs, communication between admin, academies, leads, and PLCs, and sharing positive strategies without making it required. Asking for feedback in a meaningful way. Do not ask for feedback when decisions have already been made.
---	---

B	<p>Time with PLC and Coteachers, sharing Platforms with Coteachers and allow them to modify for their caseworkers,</p> <p>Ask for feedback, feedback not utilized (second and third by other teachers)</p> <p>Accountability, same set of people who volunteer all the time</p>
C	<p>Flexibility for time/focus; authentic structures for collaboration - perhaps teacher-driven; genuine admin support for collaboration and admin support for spaces for collaboration that are protected; centralized decision-making space instead of any new idea gets a chance</p> <p>Teacher input not used, people think they “know better”</p>
D	<p>Time for planning, students in common, a purpose for the collaboration. When trying something new (like summer reading), having a financial incentive was helpful and nice. It showed that we valued people’s time and trying something new. Administrative support is essential. When there are new initiatives, there has to be a clear purpose for why/how it will help--what do we care about as a school? Who decided?</p> <p>Morale is higher than pre-AM</p> <p>More support from more people with AM, can go to admin, tended to avoid pre-AM (other teachers agreed)</p>
E	<p>Teachers finding out teaching assignments too late to be able to effectively collaborate. We need TIME, TIME, TIME</p> <p>Limited things that do not directly impact instruction</p> <p>Transparency</p> <p>Utilize teacher leaders, let them make decisions, communicate, protect time</p>
F	<p>Protected time, shared accountability -- the same people shouldn’t lead/take over the meetings every time (this is mostly about SLCs)</p>
G	<p>time. Time to spend as they need it and how to effectively use collaboration time. (Not just meeting to meet)</p>

	<p>Counselor/master schedule focus on kids and fighting for the best things for kids.</p> <p>High standards for all adults in the building. Higher standards across the board for admin/ teacher leaders/teachers</p> <p>Open responsibilities to entire staff, not just teacher leaders and admin, higher expectations across the board</p>
H	<p>Amen to protected time, on paper we have time specifically set aside to collaborate but we get forced into meetings and PD that sometimes do not connect at all to what we are trying to do in our classrooms.</p>
I	<p>Accountability for teachers and admin</p> <p>Protected time</p> <p>Consistent structure/expectations from year to year and within the school year</p>
J	<p>Regardless of structure, teacher collaboration requires time and authenticity in terms of focus. Teacher time must be protected and schedules must be designed to accommodate collaboration. Administrative asks and participation must be less check-listy and more supportive whether it's instructionally or in an advisory role regarding student needs. Anything that is expected school-wide, must be communicated clearly school-wide as opposed to different little versions being communicated formally amongst little groups and then informally amongst a half-dozen group chats. On top of this, if it's possible to communicate this school-wide info or expectations in writing, via email, we can cut the amount of time in meetings. Teachers are professionals and if they can't read and follow directions in email, then they're not doing their job. If we can save time and stress on these things, it frees up time and energy for authentic collaboration. Finally, collaboration is necessary to implement high quality instruction, to support student needs/concerns, and to effectively implement any initiatives intended to improve academics or behavior. There must be focus and clarity from the top. If ideas/tasks/programs come through that don't line up with our focus, we don't pile them on (no matter how snazzy they sound). Less is more - we must do what we do better, collaborating more fully and thoughtfully rather than checking boxes together.</p>

APPENDIX I: GROUP LEVEL ASSESSMENT THEME RANKING FORM AND RESULTS

9/14/2020

Ranking Importance

Ranking Importance

Using this form, please take a minute to rank, in order of most important (5) to least important (1) the identified themes as they relate to your experiences and thoughts about teacher collaboration.

1. Rank the themes generated from your responses in order of importance to you. Use the following scale: 5 (most important) to 1 (least important)

Mark only one oval per row.

	5	4	3	2	1
Authentic Collaboration	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Protected Time	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Flexibility	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Administrative Support	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Consistency	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Transparency	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Clear Purpose	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Teacher Input Valued and Utilized	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Consistent Accountability	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Clear Expectations for All	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Other	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

2. If you selected other, please explain:

3. Any other information you feel is important

This content is neither created nor endorsed by Google.

Google Forms

Value	Ranking Points
Protected Time	41
Teacher Input Valued and Utilized	23
Clear Purpose	20
Clear Expectations for All	17
Consistent Accountability	15
Authentic Collaboration	13
Consistency	11
Administrative Support	7
Flexibility	2
Other	1
Transparency	0

CURRICULUM VITA

NAME: Kristy Marie Field

ADDRESS: 523 Arcadia Park
Lexington, KY 40503

DOB: Beatrice, Nebraska – October 6, 1978

EDUCATION & TRAINING:

B.S., Economics
University of Rio Grande
1996-2000

M.A., Intervention Specialist – Mild to Moderate Disabilities
University of Rio Grande
2001-2005

M.A., Education Administration
Ohio University
2013-2015

Ed.D., Educational Leadership and Organizational Development
University of Louisville
2018-2020